







PUBLIC LIBRARY  
KANSAS CITY  
MO

YRABU 31004  
YTO 2A24A3  
OM





YASARLI OLUK  
YTD 22041  
OM



\$2.71

THE  
BIBLICAL  
REPERTORY

BIBLICAL REPERTORY

AND

PRINCETON REVIEW

FOR THE YEAR

1849.

VOL. XXI.

PHILADELPHIA:

WM. H. MITCHELL—265 CHESNUT STREET.

J. T. ROBINSON, PRINTER, PRINCETON.





# CONTENTS OF VOL. XXI.

## NO. I.

<b>ART. I.—1. American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions.</b>	
Special Report of the Prudential Committee, on the control to be exercised over Missionaries and Mission Churches. Printed for the use of the Board at the Annual Meeting. Revised edition.	
<b>2. Correspondence between the Cherokee and Choctaw Missions, the Rev. S. B. Treat, and the Prudential Committee. Missionary Herald, October, 1848.</b>	
	1
<b>ART. II.—The Work claiming to be the Constitutions of the Holy Apostles, including the Canons; Whiston's version, revised from the Greek; with a Prize Essay at the University of Bonn, upon their origin and contents; translated from the German, by Irah Chase, D.D.</b>	
	42
<b>ART. III.—The History of Catechizing.</b>	
	59
<b>ART. IV.—The Free Church Pulpit, consisting of Discourses by the most eminent Divines of the Free Church of Scotland in three volumes.</b>	
	82
<b>ART. V.—Divine Providence: or the Three Cycles of Revelation, showing the parallelism of the Patriarchal, Jewish, and Christian dispensations. Being a new evidence of the Divine origin of Christianity. By the Rev. George Croly, LL.D.</b>	
	97
<b>ART. VI.—A Manual of Presbytery (comprising tracts by the Rev. Dr. Miller of Princeton and the Rev. Mr. Lorimer of Glasgow.) Second edition revised and enlarged.</b>	
	116
<b>ART. VII.—An Introduction to the New Testament, containing an examination of the most important questions relating to the authority, interpretation, and integrity of the canonical books, with reference to the latest inquiries. By Samuel Davidson, LL.D. Volume I. The Four Gospels.</b>	
	144
<b>QUARTERLY LIST OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.</b>	
	149

## NO. II.

<b>ART. I.—The Natural History of Man; Comprising Inquiries into the modifying influence of Physical and Moral Agencies on the different tribes of the Human Family. By J. C. Prichard, M. D.</b>	
	159

ART. II.—The Primacy of the Apostolic See Vindicated. By Francis Patrick Kenrick, Bishop of Philadelphia. - - - -	174
ART. III.—1. Baptism, with reference to its Import and Modes. By Edward Beecher, D. D.	
2. Infant Baptism a Scriptural Service, and Dipping unnecessary to its Right Administration; containing a Critical survey of the leading Evidence, Classical, Biblical, and Patristic; with special reference to the work of Dr. Carson, and occasional strictures on the views of Dr. Halley. By the Rev. Robert Wilson, Professor of Sacred literature for the General Assembly, Royal College, Belfast. - - -	206
ART. IV.—A Memoir of the Life of James Milnor D. D., late Rector of St. George's Church, New York. By the Rev. John S. Stone, D. D., Rector of Christ Church, Brooklyn. -	236
ART. V.—Robert Burns; as a Poet, and as a Man. By Samuel Tyler, of the Maryland Bar. - - - - -	251
ART. VI.—God in Christ; Three Discourses delivered at New Haven, Cambridge, and Andover; with a preliminary Dissertation on Language. By Horace Bushnell. - - -	259
QUARTERLY LIST OF NEW PUBLICATIONS. - - - - -	298

## NO. III.

ART. I.—Annual Report of the Board of Missions of the General Assembly, of the Presbyterian Church, in the United States of America. Presented to the General Assembly, May, 1849. - - - - -	309
ART. II.—1. An Inquiry into the alleged Tendency of the Separation of Convicts, one from the other, to produce Disease and Derangement, by a citizen of Pennsylvania.	
2. Prisons and Prisoners, by Joseph Adshead.	
3. The Twentieth Annual Report of the Inspectors of the Eastern State Penitentiary of Pennsylvania. Transmitted to the Senate and House of Representatives, March, 1849.	
4. Report on the Condition of the New Jersey State Prison; embracing the Reports of the Joint Committee, Inspectors Keeper, Moral Instructor, and Physician. Read January 16, 1849, and ordered to be printed.	
5. Annual Report of the Inspectors of State Prisons of the State of New York. Made to the Legislature, January 19, 1849. - - - - -	331
ART. III.—The Apostleship a Temporary Office. - - - - -	335
ART. IV.—Ignatius von Antiochen und seine Zeit. Sieben Sendschreiben an Dr. August Neander. - - - - -	378
ART. V.—The Calcutta Review. - - - - -	403
ART. VI.—The General Assembly. - - - - -	422
QUARTERLY LIST OF NEW PUBLICATIONS. - - - - -	457



NO. IV.

ART. I.—The Family of Arnauld, as connected with Jansenism and Port-Royal. . . . .	467
ART. II.—1. Canticum Canticorum Solomonis Homiliæ XXXI, a Theod. Beza. Geneva.	
2. Song of Solomon, newly translated from the original Hebrew, with a Commentary and Annotations; by Bishop Percy.	
3. Clavis Cantici, or an exposition of the Song of Solomon, by the Rev. James Durham; with an address to the Christian reader, by John Owen.	
4. An Exposition of the Book of Solomon's Song, by John Gill, D.D.	
5. The Song of Songs, a New Translation with a commentary and Notes, by T. Williams.	
6. Critical History and Defence of the Old Testament Canon, by Moses Stuart. . . . .	503
ART. III.—1. The Constitution of Man, by George Combe—on Secrecy. See Index.	
2. The Covenant and Official Organ of the Grand Lodge of the United States. Vol. I. 1842: p. 97, on "The Secret Principle."	
3. Encyclopaedia Britannica. 7th Ed. Art. Mysteries. . . . .	533
ART. IV.—The Apostleship a Temporary Office. . . . .	542
ART. V.—The Life of Ashbel Green, V. D. M., begun to be written by himself in his eighty-second year, and continued till his eighty-fourth; prepared for the press, at the Author's request, by Joseph H. Jones, Pastor of the Sixth Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, . . . . .	563
ART. VI.—The Question of Negro Slavery and the New Constitution of Kentucky. By Robert J. Breckinridge, D.D. . . . .	582
QUARTERLY LIST OF NEW PUBLICATIONS. . . . .	608



THE  
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JANUARY 1849.

---

No. I.

---

- ART. I.—1. *American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. Special Report of the Prudential Committee, on the control to be exercised over Missionaries and Mission Churches.* Printed for the use of the Board at the Annual Meeting.\* Revised edition. Press of T. R. Marvin.
2. *Correspondence between the Cherokee and Choctaw Missions, the Rev. S. B. Treat, and the Prudential Committee.* Missionary Herald, October, 1848.

It is a matter of notoriety that the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, have for several years been sorely harassed on account of their supposed patronage or tolerance of slavery. Those known to the country as abolitionists, have felt it to be a duty to expostulate with the Board from time to time, for receiving money from the owners of slaves, for employing slaveholding missionaries, and for sustaining mission churches in which slaveholders were received as members.

\* Also published in the Missionary Herald for October, 1848.



The Board have thus been constrained to take action on this subject, and on several occasions have given deliverances which seemed to satisfy, for the time, the great body of their patrons. Still the matter has not been suffered to rest. With a view apparently of having the subject finally disposed of, the Board in 1847 adopted the following resolution, viz. "That the Prudential Committee be requested to present a written report at the next annual meeting, on the nature and extent of the control which is to be exercised over the missionaries under the care of the Board; and the moral responsibility of the Board for the nature of the teaching of the missionaries, and for the character of the churches."

In the meantime, the Prudential Committee directed the Rev. S. B. Treat, one of the secretaries, to visit the Cherokee and Choctaw Missions, "to ascertain, as fully as practicable, the state and prospects of those missions; and to inquire more particularly into their relations to the subject of slavery." Mr. Treat devoted seventeen weeks to this visitation. He held full conference with the missionaries, and at his request, each mission addressed a letter to the committee, exhibiting "their views and principles in detail," on the subject of slavery. Subsequently he drew up a report to the Prudential Committee of his visit, which report, together with the letters just mentioned, and the reply made by the committee through Mr. Treat, are all published in the *Missionary Herald* for October, 1848.

The report of the Prudential Committee, above mentioned, was submitted to the Board at its late meeting in September last, "but as the members had not time to give the subject that considerate attention which its importance demanded, the final disposition of the same was postponed." Mr. Treat's report on his mission, and the correspondence to which it gave rise, were read to the Board, and by them referred to a committee who reported that they abstained from expressing any opinion either on the letters of the missions or on that of Mr. Treat in reply, because they constitute a part of an unfinished correspondence, and because no final action could, with propriety, be had at that time. It was therefore resolved that "the whole subject should be left for the present, where it now is, in the hands of the Prudential Committee." Neither of these important documents, therefore, has yet received the sanction of the Board. In

the meantime they are published, in various forms, for information and discussion.

There are several reasons which determine us to call the attention of our readers to these documents. In the first place the principles contained in the Report of the Prudential Committee on the control of missionaries, are of great importance, affecting the whole nature and organization of the church. In the next place, those principles, and the whole subject, have as direct a bearing on the missionary operations of our church, as upon those of the American Board. Thirdly, it is to be presumed that the very design of the extensive publication of these papers, is to elicit friendly discussion. And finally, the first and most stringent application of the principles of Mr. Treat's letter, is to ministers and churches of one of our own presbyteries.

The questions embraced in the Report are discussed with singular skill and wisdom. In most points, we are happy in agreeing with its excellent authors. From some of their positions we are forced to dissent; and as far as Mr. Treat's letter is concerned, dissent must assume the form of a solemn protest, which, in that particular case, every presbyterian is entitled to enter.

The first class of subjects discussed in this Report relate to the general principles of ecclesiastical polity.

It is specially interesting to find that principles which retired men have gathered, after much study, from the scriptures, are those which practical men are led to adopt from stress of circumstances. The providence of God is forcing on the church views of its nature and polity, very different from those which theorists have in many instances entertained. It is well known e. g. that it was the common doctrine of all denominations that ordinations sine titulo are unscriptural; that the office of an evangelist was confined to the early age of the church; that those thus designated in the New Testament, were the vicarii of the apostles, vested with extraordinary powers for a special purpose and a limited time. To congregationalists no less than to prelatists, a bishop without charge was as much a solecism as a husband without a wife. A call from the people, in some form, was regarded as an essential part of a call to the ministry. Even presbyterians, though their principles involved no such conclusion, were led by their circumstances, to entertain a like,

disapprobation of such ordinations. They were an inconvenience. The whole land was possessed. No more ministers than parishes were needed, and therefore it was thought wrong to create them.

It is curious to see how all these parties have been driven, by the course of events, from their theory on this subject. Rome, petrified in one rigid form, cannot change, and therefore perpetrates the absurdity of ordaining men to extinct or imaginary dioceses. Hence we hear of the bishop of Heliopolis, or Ecbatana, or Hieropolis, even here in America. The Independents when brought into contact with the heathen, were for a long time in a strait what to do. They felt that it was a crying sin to allow their fellow men to perish in ignorance of the gospel. Christ, however, had provided, according to their system, no means of sending the gospel beyond the limits of organized churches. The office of evangelists was obsolete. Nothing therefore was to be done but to allow the heathen to perish, or to endeavour to plant churches so near them that they could individually be brought under Christian influence. Puritan piety soon burnt off these tow bonds of a narrow system. The absurdity that a church, commissioned and required to preach the gospel to every creature, could not lawfully have any preachers except among those already Christians, was soon discarded. Almost every accessible portion of the heathen world has been visited and blessed, by ministers ordained in violation of the fundamental principles of original congregationalism. Nay the old doctrine seems to be well nigh forgot. This Report says with as much confidence as though there was not a congregationalist alive, "The denial that a missionary is an office bearer until a Christian church has invited him to take the oversight of it in the Lord, is made in utter forgetfulness, as it would seem, of the commission by which a preaching ministry was originally instituted. The primary and pre-eminent design of that commission was to create the *missionary* office, and to perpetuate it until the gospel should have been preached to every creature." p. 6. Ministers in the order of nature and of time, are before churches. The missionary work has thus wrought a complete emancipation of our Congregational brethren, from a portion at least of their swaddling clothes.

The Presbyterians who came to the middle states were



scarcely less strict in their notions on this subject, than the Independents of New England. They had larger ideas of the church, and a higher view of the ministry, but they still thought that a theory elaborated in a thickly settled country, could be transferred bodily to this new world. Because Scottish law and English parliaments forbad ordinations *sine titulo*, they thought they must be wrong in themselves, except at least under very peculiar circumstances. But when they found themselves in a country where, instead of every square foot of land belonging by law to some parish, hundreds of square miles contained only here and there a Christian family, they were forced to have more ministers than organized churches. Still they could not entirely shake off the prejudices of education, and therefore as our early records show, the Presbyteries were constantly coming with the humble request to the Synod, for permission to ordain A. B. or C. D. *sine titulo*. This doctrine is however as thoroughly obsolete as the dress of our forefathers. As a matter of fact the churches do not believe it, and they do not practice upon it. They have outgrown it. Transplanted into a larger sphere and awakened to a sense of her original vocation to preach the gospel to every creature, the church feels that she has need of men to gather churches as well as to supply them, of men to exercise on all occasions, and to every willing people, and not to one congregation only, the gifts of a διδασκαλος. She has turned from the laws of European nations, made to protect bishops and rectors in the undisturbed possession of their livings, to the New Testament. There she has found no such trammels as to the exercise of her right to ordain—and somewhat to her surprise perhaps, has discovered that every minister mentioned in the scripture was ordained *sine titulo*; in other words, that there is among all the preachers named in the New Testament, scarcely one who was pastor of, a particular congregation. The church breathes rather more freely here than she did in the crowded countries of the old world. It will be labour thrown away to attempt to bring her again into bondage. This is one good service done the church by the missionary work foreign and domestic.

A second benefit to be expected from the same source is the gradual banishment of high-churchism, and the consequent promotion of Catholic unity. By high-churchism we mean the

disposition to attribute undue importance to the external organization of the church; the desire to make everything relating thereto a matter of divine right; and to insist that no society, however orthodox and pure, can be a church unless organized in one particular form. This disposition has deep root in human nature. The external and visible is ever too apt to overshadow the spiritual. It is not therefore only in Romanists and Prelatists, but even in Presbyterians and Independents we see manifestations of this spirit. Things are made obligatory, which God has left indifferent. Points are regarded as essential which are either unimportant or injurious. This spirit perverts the very nature of religion. It subjects the conscience to human authority. It alienates those who ought to be united, and is the cause of almost all the schism which afflicts, disgraces and impedes the church.

We as presbyterians of course believe that the essential principles of our system are laid down in scripture; that there is no office *jure divino* superior to that of presbyters; that the people have a right by their representatives to take part in the government of the church, and that the whole church is one, and hence a part is responsible to a larger portion, or to the whole. But we neither believe that any one mode of organization is essential to the being of the church, nor that the details of any system of church polity are laid down in scripture as universally obligatory. The idea that the church has no discretion in such matters, no liberty to adapt herself to her varying circumstances, is derived, in no small measure, from pressing unduly the analogy between the old dispensation and the new. Because everything was prescribed to the Hebrew church, it is inferred that there must be an express divine warrant for every arrangement adopted in the Christian church. Thus also it is argued that because there was a priesthood then, there must be a priesthood now; because the church and state were united then, they must be united now. The old economy was a visible theocracy, and therefore the new dispensation must be the same. Strange to say, this was the great argument and the great mistake, alike of Papists and Puritans, of the persecuting Dominicans and the intolerant Covenanters. There is nothing to favour this doctrine. The old dispensation was designed for one people,

for one very limited country, for a specific object and for a limited time. Most of its institutions also were typical, and therefore of necessity fixed. The institutions of the Christian church are not prophetic, neither are they limited to one people. They are designed for all nations, for all ages and for every part of the globe. It is inconceivable that any one outward form of the church can be suited for all these different circumstances. We can readily believe that one style of building and one mode of dress might suit all parts of Palestine, but who can believe that God would prescribe the same garments for the Arabs and the Laplanders. It is therefore *a priori* in the highest degree improbable that God ever intended to deny to his church all discretion as to the details of her organization. When we open the New Testament, the first thing that strikes the attention of the reader is, its comparative silence on this subject. It is truth, repentance towards God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ; it is the way of reconciliation with God and restoration to the divine image, which are the prominent, overshadowing subjects there presented. Prelatists meet this difficulty by acknowledging the fact, but appealing to tradition as of equal authority with the scriptures. Those Protestants who adopt the *jus divinum* principle, are obliged to substitute conjectures as to what was done, in place of positive commands as to what we should do. The fact that God has not commanded Christians to adopt any one mode of organization, is proof enough that he intended to leave his people free, within certain prescribed limits, to adapt their church polity to their circumstances.

This is the conclusion to which the work of missions is forcing all denominations of Christians. This Report avows that it is found impracticable to transfer bodily to heathen countries, any of the forms of church organization adopted in Christian lands. With regard to religious teachers the committee uses the following language: "Considering the weakness and backwardness so generally found in men just emerging from heathenism, native pastors must for a time, and in certain respects, be practically subordinate to the missionaries, by whom their churches were formed, and through whom, it may be, they are themselves partially supported. . . . Should a practical parity, in all respects, be insisted on between the missionaries



and the native pastors, in the early periods when every thing is in a forming state, it is not seen how the native ministry can be trained to system and order, and enabled to stand alone, or even to stand at all. As with ungoverned children, self-sufficiency, impatience of restraint, jealousy and other hurtful passions will be developed. The native pastors themselves are, for a season but babes in Christ, children in experience, knowledge and character. And hence missionaries, who entertain the idea that ordination must have the effect to place the native pastors at once on a perfect equality with themselves, are often backward in intrusting the responsibilities of the pastoral office to natives." p. 7. "It must be obvious that the view just taken of this subject involves no danger to the future parity of the native ministry, considered in their relation to each other, for, in the nature of things, the missionary office is scarcely more successive and communicable to native pastors than the apostolic office to evangelists." p. 8.

This appears to us perfectly reasonable and scriptural. No one would think of instituting a democracy among recently emancipated slaves, especially where they formed a majority of the community. It is not inconsistent with our republicanism that we keep the Indian tribes on our borders in a state of pupillage, or for a time appoint the governors and judges of our territories. It is a plain scriptural principle that superiority should be acknowledged and respected. Parents are superior to their immature children, and therefore it is the will of God that children should obey their parents. The inspired apostles were superior to all other ministers, and therefore they had authority over the whole church. The Romish theory on this subject is right enough, it is only false in fact. That theory is, that the bishops are apostles, and therefore have a right to govern the church. We admit that if they were apostles, that is inspired and infallible men, they would indeed have a right to rule, and that to resist them would be disobedience to God. But as they are no more inspired than other men, and are often in all respects the inferiors of their brethren, to claim for them a divine right to rule, becomes an unscriptural and most hurtful usurpation. It is not the mere transient inequalities as to age and capacity, such as exist among men born and educated under the same circumstances, that can lay any adequate foundation for offi-

cial subordination. It must be of such a nature as in the cases referred to, as creates a real incapacity on the one side to share in the duties and responsibilities of the other side. That such a disparity does exist between European and American missionaries and their heathen converts, cannot be denied. Such converts, however, must be employed as religious teachers, both because the field is far too large for the missionaries to cultivate alone, and because in this way only can a native ministry be trained up. Being however children in comparison to the missionaries, they must be treated as such. They are in such a sense inferior that they must be subordinate. The providence of God has already forced the missionaries, especially in the Sandwich Islands, to act upon this principle. There a single missionary has under his care a church with four or five thousand communicants. This supposes a congregation of from ten to fifteen thousand persons. It is impossible that the pastor can adequately minister to such a multitude. He must have helpers. Those assistants must be taken from among the native converts. The pastor selects them, assigns them their district or sphere of labour, tells them what they must do, superintends their instructions, and advances them from one kind of duty to a higher as they increase in capacity. Whatever names may be given to these assistants, it would be hard to find anything on scriptural grounds to object to such an arrangement.

As to the organization of mission churches, the Report before us says: "When the time comes for organizing native converts into churches, the missionaries, acting in behalf of these children in knowledge and in the power of self-organization and government, cannot properly be restrained, by foreign interference, from conforming the organization to what *they* regard as the apostolical usage in similar cases, having respect, of course to those necessary limitations already mentioned."\* p. 31. "The result

\* Reference is here made to pp. 12, 13 of the Report, where it is said the missionary comes under certain well understood pledges. "1. As to *his manner of life*; which is to be one of exemplary piety and devotion to his work. 2. As to *his teaching*; which must be conformed to the evangelical doctrines generally received by the churches, and set forth in their well known Confessions of Faith. 3. As to *ecclesiastical usages*; to which he must conform substantially as they prevail among the churches operating through the Board. He must hold to a clerical parity among the brethren of the mission. He must hold to the validity of infant baptism. He must admit only such to the Lord's Supper, as give credible evidence of faith in Christ. So far as his relation to the Board and his stand-

may be a much simpler organization for the mission churches, than is found in lands that have long sat under the light and influences of the gospel. Indeed, experience has clearly shown, that it is not well to attempt the transfer of religious denominations of Christendom, full-grown and with all their peculiarities, into heathen lands, at least until the new-born churches shall have had time to acquire a good degree of discriminative and self-governing power. The experience acquired in lands long Christian, partially fails us when we go into heathen countries. We need to gain a new experience, and to revise many of our principles and usages; and for this purpose to go prayerfully to the New Testament." p. 31.

"The religious liberty which we ourselves enjoy, is equally the birth-right of Christian converts in every part of the heathen world, on coming into the spiritual kingdom of Jesus Christ, which they may claim as soon as they are prepared for it; just as American freedom is the birth-right of our own children. The right of our children is not infringed by that dependence and control which they need during their infancy and childhood. It is even their right to claim, that the parent shall thus act for them in the early stages of their existence. But the wise parent will always form the principles and habits of his child with reference to the time when the right of self-control must be fully exercised and yielded. In like manner the missionary must needs give form, at the outset, to the constitution and habits of mission churches, and for a time he must virtually govern them, But he will do this with a constant regard to a coming period, when those churches must and will act independently." p. 32.

Experience then has led the authors of this Report to recognise the following principles. 1. That a call from a church is not necessary to a call to the ministry; or, that ministers may properly be ordained *sine titulo*; or, that the office of an evangelist is not obsolete. 2. That such evangelists have all the rights and prerogatives belonging to the ministerial office. They are true office-bearers in the church of God. 3. That they may exercise a wide discretion as to the mode in which they organize churches gathered from among the heathen. 4. That mission

ing in the mission are concerned, he is of course not pledged to conform his proceedings to any other book of discipline than the New Testament."



churches have all the rights which belong to other Christian churches, though for a time they may properly be retained in a state of pupilage.

These principles must commend themselves to every candid reader. Regeneration does not convert an African into an European, or a Hindoo into an American. The heathen among whom our missionaries labour are far behind the Jews, Greeks and Romans to whom the apostles preached. As the church is to be established among all sorts of men, Hottentots, Hindoos, Sandwich Islanders, Indians, Greeks and Barbarians, wise and unwise, it must have liberty to adapt itself to these diverse circumstances. To transfer congregationalism to a heathen country, would be destructive, and has been found impossible. This fact should teach our eastern brethren that their system is not *jure divino* for all Christians, and should moderate the tone of assumption, which in some parts of the country, has begun to prevail on this subject. We do not pretend that Scotch Presbyterianism can be transferred bodily to our infant missionary churches. But we are disposed to make this claim in behalf of the genuine principles of continental and American presbyterianism. They have an elasticity which admits of their being suited to every change of circumstances. It is no violation of those principles to have preaching and teaching elders, subordinate to the pastor, as in the French churches; nor where suitable elders are scarce, to have several churches under one session or consistory as in various parts of Europe. We believe that God has mercifully left his people at liberty, within certain general principles laid down in his word, to modify their church polity as his providence may render expedient, and yet under all these forms to remain faithful to the radical principles of presbyterianism. It is not our purpose, however, to glorify presbyterianism; on the contrary we wish to express our sympathy with the Catholic spirit of this Report, and to show how much against the providence as well as the word of God, is the exclusive high-church principle, which would transfer to the Christian church all the trammels, which, for wise reasons, were imposed on the church before the advent.

The second subject considered by the committee is the responsibility of missionaries.

What security have the churches at home for the fidelity of the men sent to plant the gospel among the heathen? The answer given to this question is—1. The care taken in the selection of the men. 2. The definite and well-understood engagements into which the missionary enters. 3. His claim to support like that of a pastor, depends on his fulfilling his engagements. 4. The Board have a right to enforce this fidelity, not by ecclesiastical censures, but by dissolving the connexion of the missionary with itself and with the mission. 5. The mutual watch and care of the missionaries over each other, and the direct influence of truth on their minds and hearts. 6. The influence of public sentiment at home. The missionaries know that in a peculiar manner the eyes of the church are fixed upon them, and that any failure on their part must be attended with special disgrace. To all this is to be added, if not included under number five, the responsibility of the missionary to the ecclesiastical body at home to which he may belong. These to say the least, are as secure pledges for the faithful discharge of their duties as can be given by ministers in this country. Experience shows this to be the case. They have their infirmities and their difficulties; but it is matter of devout thankfulness to God, that American missionaries have been an honour and blessing to their country, and sustain a character in all respects equal to any similar body of men in the foreign field.

The rights and responsibilities of the Board in relation to missionaries and mission churches, is the third topic discussed.

This is much the most difficult and delicate division of the whole subject. The principles advocated in this Report are the following. 1. The Board has no ecclesiastical control, properly speaking, either over the missionaries or their churches. It can neither depose nor excommunicate, nor in any way effect the ecclesiastical standing of those under its care. pp. 13, 22. 2. It has the right to enforce fidelity on the part of the missionaries to their engagements. Those engagements include among other particulars, *a.* Exemplary Christian conduct. *b.* Correct religious teaching. *c.* Conformity to established ecclesiastical usages. *d.* Proper diligence in the discharge of their duties. pp. 12, 13, 21, 38. 3. The rule by which the Board purpose to judge of the religious teaching of their missionaries is, “the evangelical

doctrines generally received by the churches, and set forth in their well-known Confessions of Faith." p. 13. "Many things," it is said, "which at first, it might seem desirable for the Board to do, are found on a nearer view, to lie entirely beyond its jurisdiction; so that to attempt them would be useless, nay, a ruinous usurpation. Nor is the Board at liberty to withdraw its confidence from missionaries, because of such differences of opinion among them, as are generally found and freely tolerated in presbyteries, councils, associations, and other bodies here at home." p. 17. The standard of judgment as to matters of polity is, "the ecclesiastical usages" which "prevail among the churches operating through the Board." "While the Board may not establish new principles in matters purely ecclesiastical, it may enforce the observance of such as are generally acknowledged by the churches, and were understood to be acknowledged by the missionaries when sent to their fields." p. 13. 4. The Board, is therefore, "responsible *directly*, in the manner which has been described, for the teaching of the missionaries." p. 38. 5. The Board is not responsible *directly* for the character of the mission churches. If there be evils, even scandalous wickedness in those churches, they can be reached only through the missionaries. p. 39. When evils exist however in the mission churches the committee may and must inquire whether the missionaries are doing their duty.

This we believe to be a correct statement of the views of the committee in relation to their authority and responsibility in reference to the missionaries and the mission churches. From this it appears that the committee claim for the Board the right not only to enforce the fidelity and diligence of those under its care, as missionaries, but their correct teaching and discipline, as ministers. It is assumed that the Board has the right, in all cases, to judge of that correctness. They can inflict no ecclesiastical censure, but they can dissolve the connection between the missionary and the mission for error in doctrine, or discipline.

We of course do not controvert all the positions above quoted from the Report. Nor do we deny that the Board, under peculiar circumstances, may rightfully exercise all the powers here claimed in its behalf. The above view of the subject, however, involves, in our judgment, an important misapprehension of the relation of the Board both to the churches at home, and to the mission-

aries and churches abroad. The Board is simply the agent, and not the plenipotentiary of the church. It does not stand in the place of the churches, nor is it invested with all the oversight and control over the missionaries, which the church may properly exercise. It stands related to those whom it sends out, as missionaries, and not as ministers. Every such messenger to the heathen sustains a twofold relation, the one as a missionary to the Board, the other as a minister to his ecclesiastical superiors or associates. To the former, he is responsible for his conduct as a missionary; he must go where he is sent; stay where he is required to remain; perform that part of the missionary work which may be assigned to him, &c., &c. To the latter, he is responsible for his doctrines and ministerial conduct. Where a missionary stands isolated, or has no ecclesiastical supervisors, or none who can act as such, then as a matter of necessity, the consideration of his doctrine and acts of discipline, falls under the cognizance of the Board; not however as a part of their appropriate function, but on the same principle that in cases of emergency, every citizen, and not merely the police, is bound to enforce the law of the land.

The case of a missionary is analogous to that of an officer of the army. Every such officer bears a twofold relation; the one to his military superiors, the other to the civil authorities. As an officer, he is to be judged by the articles of war; as a citizen, by the laws of the land. For the Secretary at War, or commanding general, to take into his hands the administration of the civil law, is equivalent to the proclamation of martial law. In like manner for the Board of Missions to undertake to judge of matters of doctrine and discipline, would be like putting the whole missionary world in a state of siege.

If the Board is the agent of the churches for the conduct of missions, it is clear, 1. That it has the right to select and send forth missionaries, to determine their location, to superintend and direct their labours, to enforce fidelity and diligence, and in general to do whatever is requisite for the successful prosecution of their work, which is not otherwise provided for. 2. That the Board has the *power* to discard any missionary at pleasure, i. e., for any reason that to them may seem sufficient. It may be incompetency, indolence, ill-temper, or any other cause.



3. The only question is, what are the reasons which *justify* an exercise of that power? It is evident that those reasons may be perfectly adequate; or they may be insufficient; or they may be such as involve a breach of trust on the part of the Board toward the churches. If, for example, they should discard a missionary because he was a Calvinist or Paedo-baptist, that would clearly be a breach of faith with those churches for whom they act and from whom they derive their funds. 4. The points on which we think it important to insist are these: First, that no doctrine or mode of teaching can be an adequate ground for discarding any missionary, which doctrine or mode of teaching is sanctioned by the churches operating through the Board; and that no mode of church organization, or condition of church membership, can be a justifiable reason for withholding aid and fellowship from a mission church, which mode of organization and condition of church membership, is approved by those churches. And secondly, that the question whether a given doctrine is consistent with the faith of those churches, or a given mode of organization, or condition of church membership is compatible with their discipline, is one for those denominations and not for the Board to decide. That is, the Board cannot go behind the decisions of those churches, and pronounce that to be inconsistent with their doctrines, which they say is consistent, or that to be incompatible with their discipline, which they say is conformable to it.

It is hardly to be presumed that the Prudential Committee would dissent from either of these propositions as thus stated. And yet they are very different from the principles of their report, and lead to widely different practical results. The principal points of difference are these two. *First.* The Report assumes that the Board is directly responsible for the teaching of the missionaries, and of course have the right to superintend and direct it. Hence the committee call up the missionaries and interrogate them, Do you think so and so? Do you teach thus and thus? According to our view this responsibility does not rest upon the committee (unless as a derelict) but upon the ecclesiastical body, presbytery, classis, or association to which the missionary belongs. *Second.* The Report, as a necessary consequence of the assumed responsibility on the part of the Board

for the teaching of the missionaries, claims for it the right of judging of that teaching; of deciding whether it is consistent with the generally received doctrines of the churches; and of matters of church polity and discipline, whether they are consistent or otherwise with established ecclesiastical usage. We on the other hand, must deny to the Board any such right, (except as before said in the absence of the legitimate judges of such matters). The right of judging must rest where the responsibility is.

That our view of this important subject is the correct one, we think will appear from the following considerations. 1. The Board is not an ecclesiastical body. It disclaims all ecclesiastical authority. But to sit in judgment on the orthodoxy of ministers, to determine whether their doctrines are consistent with "the well-known Confession of Faith," or their principles of polity and discipline, with established ecclesiastical usage, is one of the very highest and most difficult duties of an ecclesiastical tribunal. It is, from the nature of the case, ecclesiastical control in the truest and highest sense of the term. It is of no account to say that the Board cannot affect the ecclesiastical standing or privileges of those whom it judges. The nature of the cause depends on the matter tried, and not on the character of the penalty. Deposition and excommunication are rare ecclesiastical inflictions. Admonition and other milder censures are much more frequent. That the effect of an unfavourable decision by the Board is disgrace, the loss of standing and the loss of support, instead of temporary suspension from church privileges, does not alter the case. If the judgment be rendered for error in doctrine, it is an ecclesiastical judgment, whatever may be the nature of the penalty. In England, the courts having jurisdiction over clergymen, for clerical offences, whether the Court of Arches or the Privy Council, are courts of ecclesiastical control, even though the penalty they impose be fine or loss of stipend. The report says: "The question assumes a plain business form—whether there is an actual departure from the basis, on which the missionary appointment was made, and what effect it has exerted on the peace and usefulness of the mission, and on the operations of the Board." (p. 22.) This is not one whit a plainer question, nor one whit more a business matter, than a trial for heresy before a presbytery. In this latter case, the simple question is, "whether there is an actual

departure from the basis on which" the man was received into the presbytery. If the latter is an ecclesiastical question so is the former. They are both questions relating to the orthodoxy of ministers. And the body authorized to sit in judgment on that question, is vested with ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The right therefore to judge of such matters does not belong to the Board, for by common consent they have no ecclesiastical control.

2. 'This authority to judge in matters of doctrine does not belong to the Board. It was never committed to them by any power, human or divine. It does not inhere in them in virtue of their constitution, nor has it been delegated to them by the churches.

3. It is an authority which the Board is not competent to exercise. The Board itself meets but once in the year, and that only for a few days. Its authority is really in the hands of the Prudential Committee. Such a committee, however, is evidently not a competent tribunal to sit in judgment on the ministerial character, the orthodoxy or heterodoxy, of hundreds of missionaries in all parts of the world. They are, in many cases laymen, and have not the competent knowledge. Lawyers would not like to see clergymen set to administer the laws of the land. And, without disrespect, it may be said, that if there is anything from which ministers and the church need pray to be delivered, it is from being subject to civil judges, in ecclesiastical matters. Judge Roger's decision has given a wholesome lesson on that subject to old school Presbyterians, and the decision of Judge Gibson, we hope, has been equally beneficial to our new school brethren. Besides the incompetency arising from want of training, any such body, as the Prudential Committee, is too remote from the person to be tried. They cannot adequately examine into any such case, unless it happens to be one of the most open and notorious character. They cannot however calculate upon always having cases of that kind. They may be called upon to determine whether a given doctrine is not Arminian or Pelagian, and a real denial of the well known creed of the churches. Besides all this they have no promise of divine guidance in this matter.

4. The power in question is both onerous and dangerous. One would think the Prudential Committee had work enough on their hands, in superintending so many missions in every

part of the world, with all their complicated concerns, without assuming the additional burden of directing the teaching, and judging the orthodoxy of some hundreds of missionaries. We doubt not the committee would rejoice to see themselves exempted from all responsibility on that subject. It is besides rather incongruous with our Protestant and especially our American ideas, that five or six men in Boston or New York, should have the power to determine what doctrines shall, and what shall not be taught in Europe, Asia, Africa and America; and to decide whether this or that opinion is consistent with the standards of evangelical churches. How much controversy have we had on that very point in all parts of the country. How earnestly has it been debated in New England itself. How decided were such men as Cornelius and Nettleton that certain doctrines whose advocates were neither few nor inconsiderable, ought not to be tolerated in our churches at home or abroad. Is the Prudential Committee prepared to decide all these litigated points? They must of necessity either exercise an intolerable power, or they must in a great measure let things take their course. Generally they would pursue the latter method, and every now and then the former. But the churches never can long recognise a power at war with all our ecclesiastical institutions. It would be very much like the republicanism which they have in Paris under General Cavaignac.

5. It is altogether unnecessary that the power to inspect the teaching of the missionaries and to judge of their doctrines, should be lodged in the hands either of the Board or of the Prudential Committee. It is far more safe and effective, if lodged elsewhere. The committee do not receive a missionary in the first instance, on the ground of any personal knowledge of his orthodoxy. They do not subject him to any theological examination. They take his orthodoxy for granted on the authority of the presbytery or the council that ordained him. They may refuse to receive him for ill-health, ignorance, unamiableness, or other reasons of like nature, but they could not refuse his services because he held any opinion which the church to which he belongs, and the body which ordained him, pronounce to be sound. In the first instance then, the committee are relieved of the responsibility of judging of matters of doctrine, and disclaim all right to review the decisions of com-



petent church courts. When the missionary enters upon his field, he retains his ecclesiastical connexion whatever it was. He remains a minister of the Dutch, of the Presbyterian, or of the Congregational church or denomination. In all ordinary cases, three, six, or more ministers belong to one station. If they are Presbyterians they form a Presbytery, if Congregationalists, an Association. There is just the same oversight over the orthodoxy of a member of the Choctaw Presbytery of Indian, as of a member of the Presbytery of New York. There is just as much security for the correct teaching of a Congregational minister in Ceylon, as for a similar minister in Connecticut. In all such cases the responsibility rests with the ministerial associates of the missionary. It is the doctrine of all the churches operating through the Board, that a minister is subject to his brethren in the Lord. That subjection is neither thrown off nor transferred when he becomes a missionary. If no man or committee is entitled to question a member of the Presbytery of New York, or of the Association of East Windsor, about his doctrines, no man or committee can question the members of a presbytery or association in a foreign land.

Placing the responsibility for the teaching of the missionaries, and the right to judge concerning it on their ministerial associates, has, it seems to us, every thing in its favour. It is according to principle. It is what all churches do in this country, and what they all say ought to be done. It is one of the most valuable rights of the ministry. It is to them what trial by jury is in the state. It is far more safe and effective as a method of control. It relieves the committee of a burdensome, invidious and most dangerous prerogative. And finally it is right, and the other wrong.

It has already been admitted, that where a missionary is perfectly isolated, where he has no ministerial associates, then from the necessity of the case, his responsibility is to the committee. But these are rare cases, and ought not to be permitted to occur.

6. Operating on the principle here advocated, would free the committee from a great deal of embarrassment. The Congregational, Dutch Reformed, and a large part of the Presbyterian churches make the American Board their agent for conducting foreign missions. Those denominations have severally their standards of doctrine, and each its own method of deter-

mining what is and what is not consistent with its faith and discipline. Let them decide such matters. So long as a minister is *rectus in ecclesia* with the Dutch or the Presbyterians, the committee are free from all responsibility as to his doctrine. So long as those churches allow of a certain mode of church organization, or condition of church membership, the committee have nothing to say in the matter. If the venerable Mr. Kingsbury stands well in his own presbytery, the five or six gentlemen in Boston composing the Prudential Committee, may well rest satisfied with his doctrines. If father Spaulding, in Ceylon, has the confidence of all his ministerial associates, the churches in this country will not be suspicious of his orthodoxy. If the Dutch Reformed or Presbyterians allow those who drink wine or hold slaves to come to the Lord's table, the blame, if there be any, rests with them. How can the committee help it? Will they withhold the money contributed by those denominations from churches who do exactly what they are allowed to do by their ecclesiastical superiors? The committee themselves say they cannot withdraw their confidence from any missionary for any opinion tolerated by the churches at home. (p. 17.) Then why not let the churches decide whether a doctrine or usage is tolerated in fact, and ought to be so. This is all we contend for, viz. that it rests with the churches, i. e., with the regular ecclesiastical authorities, to judge whether the doctrines and discipline of the missionaries and their churches are to be tolerated or not. We can hardly think of a case where this principle would not apply. In all the large missions of the Board, there are ministers and church members enough to constitute as trustworthy a tribunal as can be formed at home. If those ministers form a presbytery or classis, there is an appeal from their decision to the Synod or General Assembly. If they form an association or council, that is the highest tribunal known to the Congregational churches. If a mission, presbytery or association become decidedly heretical, they are to be treated precisely as such bodies would be treated at home. But the question of heresy is one for the churches and not for the committee to decide. The New School General Assembly allow slaveholders to come to the Lord's table. Shall the committee, agents of the New School Presbyterians, refuse to sustain such churches, or shall they throw the responsibility on the denominations to which

the churches belong? We think the latter is the only course consistent with right principles, or compatible with the harmonious action of the numerous patrons of the Board.

Much therefore as we admire this Report in many of its features, and greatly as we respect the source whence it proceeds, we cannot but believe that the committee have misconceived the relation in which the Board stands, as well to the churches at home, as to the missionaries abroad. The Board is not the plenipotentiary of the churches, to secure the orthodoxy of missionaries or the purity of mission-churches. It is an agent for employing such missionaries and planting such churches abroad, as the churches at home approve. The missionaries are responsible to the Board for their fidelity and diligence as missionaries, but for their doctrines and discipline as ministers, they are responsible to the denominational churches to which they belong, which churches are represented by the ministerial associates with whom the missionaries are connected.

We have not said a word against the organization of the Board. We would not for any consideration lisp a syllable that could in any way do them harm. We most unfeignedly rejoice in their great success and usefulness. We conceive we are doing them a friendly act in publishing this review. It is right to discuss, with respect and kind feeling, a question in which all churches, and the Presbyterian especially, are deeply concerned. We believe it is perfectly easy for the American Board so to conduct their operations, as not to come into collision with the rights of the churches. We believe, moreover, that any departure from that way will be found to be, in the language of this Report, "a ruinous usurpation."

That the misconception of the true relation of the Board to the church and the missionaries, to which we have referred, is a very serious matter, is evident from the letter of the Rev. Mr. Treat to the Cherokee and Choctaw missions. In the existing state of the church and of the country, we cannot regard the adoption of that letter by the Prudential Committee and its publication, as anything short of a national calamity. The elements of strife and disunion are already so numerous and powerful, that the accession of a body, among the most influential in the whole land, to the side of separation, must be regarded as a most

serious event. Should that letter be ultimately sanctioned by the Board, as it has already been by the Prudential Committee, the consequences must be disastrous. As soon as the letter was read, its true character was apparent. The abolitionists at once said, We ask nothing more; that is our creed. One of those abolitionists since his return home has published a manifesto, giving an account of his visit to Boston, of his fidelity to his principles, and of the action of the Board. In that publication, he says, "While slavery has a tolerated existence in churches planted and watered by those Boards, (of Foreign and Domestic Missions,) it will be impossible to bring American Christianity into that open and honest antagonism with slavery, which is necessary for its destruction." Mr. Secretary Treat has done what was promised a year ago, "to the entire satisfaction of the most decided abolitionists of Boston and vicinity, and to my own." "If," says he, "the missionaries obey (the instructions of the committee) they are abolitionists. If they disobey, they will be dropped." "I am satisfied," he adds, "with the above action of the committee. Deference to opposing opinions has made them use much indirectness and verbosity, in stating their abolition creed, but it is an abolition creed nevertheless." After referring to the action of the Board in the premises, he says, "I see not what the Board could have done farther, unless they had resolved to cut off the missionaries without waiting to see whether they would obey the instructions of their committee or not. "Let us sustain the American Board in the anti-slavery race which it has so well begun. It will be deplorable indeed, if anti-slavery men do not supply any falling off of funds in pro-slavery sections of the country. Let us unitedly move the Home Missionary Society to plant the South with a slavery expelling gospel."\*

Such is the interpretation put upon Mr. Treat's letter, by the abolitionists, and such, we are deeply grieved to say, appears to us its only true interpretation. The American Board of Commissioners is beyond doubt one of the noblest institutions of benevolence in the world. All Christians, yea, all mankind are interested in its proper management. A fearful responsibility rests on those who are at the helm of that noble ship. Under the guidance of strong and skillful hands, she has hith-

\* Pres. Blanchard's Appeal, as given in the Christian Mirror, Portland, Nov. 20, 1849.



erto weathered every storm. She is now approaching, with all her canvass spread, the outer circle of the great whirlpool of fanaticism. The slightest deviation from the proper course, must bring her within the sweep of that fearful current. Those on board may, for a while, exult in her accelerated motion. But every practised eye can see, from the quivering of her sails, that such acceleration is due, not to the favouring breezes, but to the [dreadful undertow, which must inevitably engulf every thing yielded to its power.

A brief analysis of this Letter will enable the reader to judge of its true character. There are three points as to which it expresses the views of the committee. 1. As to slavery and slaveholding. 2. As to the duty of the missionaries in relation to it. 3. The power and authority of the committee in the premises.

As to the first of these points the letter says: "Domestic slavery is at war with the rights of man, and opposed to the principles of the gospel." "It is an anti-christian system, and hence you have a right to deal with it accordingly. True, it is regulated by law, but it does not for that reason lose its moral relations. Suppose polygamy or intemperance were hedged in by legal enactments, could you not speak against them as crying evils?"

Though the system is always and everywhere sinful, yet slaveholding is not always a sin, provided, 1. The slaveholder enters the relation and continues in it, involuntarily; or, 2. That he holds the relation simply for the benefit of the slave. The slaveholder may indeed misjudge in not granting immediate emancipation. In that case, "the continuance of the relation is wrong, but the master may stand acquitted in the sight of God, because influenced solely by benevolent motives."

Christ and his apostles, though they did not expressly condemn slavery, said much which "bears strongly against it. If the single precept, 'Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them,' were carried out, it would cease at once in all its essential features." The directions given in the New Testament, as to the relative duties of masters and slaves, are said to be "consistent with the hypothesis that the apostles regarded the general relation as unnatural and sinful." "But why," asks the writer, "did not the apostles directly affirm the sinfulness of slavery? Why did they not insist on the

duty of emancipation? Simply because (if we may presume to give an opinion) they saw such a course, in their circumstances, would not soonest and best extirpate the evil."

As to the duty of missionaries in reference to slavery this letter teaches, 1. That they should denounce it. The only question is as to time and mode. This must be left to their discretion, but apostolic example does not justify continued silence. If after twenty-five years, that time has not yet come, in those Indian missions, the committee say, "We may well ask, When will it come?" 2. If a recent convert is connected with slavery, the missionary should inquire into his views of that institution. 3. If he proposes to come to the Lord's supper, he must "prove himself free from the guilt of that system, before he can make good his title to a place among the followers of Christ." He must show either, 1. That his "being the owner of slaves is involuntary on his part," or, 2. That "he retains the legal relation at their request and for their advantage," and that "he utterly repudiates the idea of holding property in his fellow-men." 3. The committee, "denying that there can be morally or scripturally, any right of property in any human being, unless it be for crime, and holding that the slave is always to be treated as a man, suppose that whatever is done in plain and obvious violation of these principles, may properly receive the notice of yourselves and your sessions." 4. The missionaries are to pursue such a course that the mission churches may soon be freed "from all participation in a system that is so contrary to the spirit of the gospel and so regardless of the rights of man." 5. They are to abstain from using slave labour. "It is with profound regret," the committee say, "that we have learned how many hired slaves are now in the service of the Choctaw mission. We readily acquit you of any plan or purpose to disregard our known wishes on the subject. We cheerfully accept the excuse you offer, namely, that the boarding schools established in 1843, in consequence of an arrangement made with the Choctaw government, in your view made such assistance necessary, and that you supposed the committee must have assented to its employment." "This engagement with the Choctaw government has some fifteen years to run, and yet we do not feel willing to be a party to the hiring of slaves for this long period. By so doing, as it seems to us, we

countenance and encourage the system. We make this species of labour more profitable to the owner; at the same time that we put it into his power, if he will, to plead our example to justify or excuse the relation. In this state of things, it appears to be our duty to ask you first of all, to inquire once more into the supposed necessity of this practice, and to see if slave labour cannot in some way be dispensed with. And if you can discover no method by which a change can be effected, we submit for your consideration whether it be not desirable to request the Choctaw government to release us from our engagement in respect to the boarding schools. It is with pain that we present this alternative; but such are our views of duty in the case, that we cannot suggest a different course."

This practical question as to the propriety of employing slave-labour, stands, in a measure, by itself. We would venture to remark respecting it, 1. That as it is properly a secular matter, connected immediately with the schools, which are the property and under the control of the committee, they may be entitled to use the strong language of authority, which is employed in this letter. 2. It is no doubt conceivable that to employ such labour may be very inexpedient. If any considerable number of Christians are offended by it, or if any are thereby led into sin, it may be well to abstain from it, on the same principle that Paul said he would eat no meat while the world stood, if meat made his brother to offend. 3. The reasons, however, assigned by the committee are to us very unsatisfactory. Those reasons are all founded on the assumption that slaveholding is sinful. Otherwise there could be no scruples of conscience in the case. The committee would not hesitate to allow the missionaries to set to those around them a Christian example as to the method of treating and instructing slaves, did they not regard the "relation itself as unnatural and sinful." The slaves often earnestly desire to be employed by the mission, their condition is thereby improved, their privileges increased, and they are thus brought into the way of religious instruction, and perhaps of salvation. Unless slaveholding is a sin, it is hard to see how the force of these considerations is to be resisted. 4. The committee urge that by allowing the mission to hire slaves, they sanction the system and put it into the power of the owner to plead their example to justify the relation. This is not the fair interpreta-

tion of their conduct. Nothing more than the recognition of a *de facto* relation is involved in employing slaves. No opinion is thereby expressed of the justice of the relation. When one government recognises another, it is only as *de facto* not as *de jure*. It would involve endless difficulty and doubt, if such recognition was understood to be a judgment as to the legitimate or equitable title of the government recognised. It is so also with matters of property. Does every man who buys land of the United States, thereby sanction the equity of all the treaties by which that land was acquired? The settlers in New Holland are not understood to pronounce judgment on the justice of the sentences by which the men they hire, are consigned to bondage? Those who employed, and those who redeemed the Christian captives in Algiers, did not sanction the piracy by which those captives were obtained? What would be thought of a father, who should allow his son to pine in hopeless bondage, refusing to pay his ransom, because by so doing he would admit the right of his master, and render piracy more profitable? If such conduct would be unnatural, to us it seems no less unnatural, that a Christian Board should refuse to hire slaves to their own advantage, refuse to bring them under the influence of the gospel, lest they should be understood to sanction slavery. 5. The principle on which the committee act in this matter cannot be consistently carried out. Every use we make of the products of slave labour, is an encouragement to slavery. If all men were to agree not to use anything in the production of which slaves have been employed, slavery must instantly cease. This is not done here at the North. We presume it is not done by the committee. It is not done by the missionaries. They doubtless consume the wheat, the beef, the corn which slaves have assisted in raising. It therefore seems very strange, that the committee should say, they will give up their schools rather than sanction slavery, when they will not give up the sugar for their coffee for the same reason.

The missionaries require a great deal of assistance in their domestic and farming operations. Free labour is very difficult to be obtained. The plan of sending out assistant missionaries, has been tried and failed. The use of slave labour has been sanctioned by the former officers of the Board. In 1825 the Prudential committee resolved, that they "did not see cause to



prohibit the practice." In 1836 they resolved to dispense altogether with slave labour, but on a representation having been made by the missionaries that they could not get on without it, "the matter was left to their Christian discretion." There the subject has been left until the present excitement has called it up, and so disturbed the conscience of the committee, that they are forced to submit the alternative to the missionaries to give up their schools, or do without slave labour. This we regard as a very perverted judgment. It is straining at a gnat, while swallowing a camel. It is being dreadfully troubled about the mote in our brother's eye, while unmindful of the beam that is in our own eye. The encouragement given to slavery by the missions in hiring a few slaves, much to their own benefit, is as nothing, compared with that afforded by the wholesale use of the products of slave labour, by the good people of Boston. We are sincerely sorry to say that this whole letter seems to us full of a mistaken self-righteous spirit; carping at trifles in laborious devoted men in the wilderness; while blind to tenfold greater evils of the same nature, which pass without rebuke in our pampered churches at home.

The doctrine then of this letter is that slavery is every where and at all times sinful. Christ condemned it, though not in words. The apostles abstained from denouncing it, only on motives of expediency. Slaveholding is excusable and consistent with church-membership only when involuntary, or when temporarily continued at the request of the slave and for his benefit. The missionaries are to inculcate these principles, and to pursue such a course as shall free the mission churches from all participation in the system. Even hiring slaves is to be abstained from, though the consequence be the disbanding the missionary schools. We have never understood that the avowed abolitionists go any farther than this. They inculcate these doctrines in plainer terms, and in a more straight-forward, clear-headed manner. They are more peremptory in their demands, and violent in their spirit. But as to all essential matters, their doctrines are those here presented.

The third point on which the committee touch, is their own authority in reference to this whole subject. They say, 1. "We do not claim any *direct*\* control over the churches which you

\* The Italics are not ours.

have gathered, nor shall we ever approach them in the language of authority or dictation." We can suppose a case "in which we might be constrained by the sacredness of the trust committed to us, to withhold that pecuniary aid it has given us, in past years, so much pleasure to afford." 2. "We do not wish *you*, either individually or collectively to bring any other influence to bear on those churches or the community in which you dwell, except such as belongs to the ministerial office." 3. "We do not design to infringe in the least, by what we shall say in this letter, upon your rights as ministers of the Lord Jesus Christ." That is, the committee does not claim what, even a presbytery or a bishop, would not think of assuming, the right of dictation in matters of discipline. Nor do they wish the missionaries to assume that power to the exclusion of their sessions, or to the infringement of the rights of the churches. Nor finally do they claim any authority over the missionaries themselves, inconsistent with their office as ministers. Their whole claim is that they have the right to withhold pecuniary aid from those churches, which do not conform their discipline to the views of the committee; and from those ministers who do not obey their instructions as to their manner of teaching. This is the precise doctrine of the Report, viz. that the Board are responsible for the teaching of the missionaries, and therefore have the right to examine into what that teaching is, and to direct what it should be; and to withdraw their patronage from missionaries and churches, who do not conform to their instructions. The missionaries have been led to take this view of the power claimed by the committee, and to regard themselves and their churches as entirely in the hands of the Board. If on account of our views on this subject, they say, "the Committee or Board can no longer sustain us, if they must withdraw from us their support, and so far as they are concerned, leave the Cherokee people without the preaching of the word of God, then wherever the responsibility belongs there let it rest. . . . We pray the committee to remember that if the patronage of the Board be withdrawn from us, it will not be for the violation, on our part, of any condition on which we were sent into the field; but in consequence of new conditions, with which we cannot in conscience comply." Again, "If support be withdrawn from us on account of views

which we have expressed in this communication, it will of necessity be, so far as the Board are concerned, an entire withholding of the word of God from the Cherokee people. For to withcall us on this ground, and to send others who would pursue an opposite course, would be manifestly preposterous and vain." There is no doubt, therefore, as to how the missionaries have been taught to view this matter. So also in the passage quoted above from Pres. Blanchard's appeal, it is said with approbation, "If the missionaries obey, they are abolitionists; if they disobey, they are dropped." The committee claim therefore, in this letter, as we understand them, and as they seem to be universally understood, the right to withhold pecuniary aid from missionaries and mission churches unless they become abolitionists.

1. Our first objection then to this letter, as may be inferred from what we have already said, is that it proceeds on a misapprehension of the true relation and powers of the Board. It assumes that the Board is responsible for the teaching of the missionaries, and therefore has the right to judge of it, and to direct it. This we have endeavoured to show is a mistake. The Board are the agents, and not the plenipotentiaries of the churches. The churches have never committed to them the right to judge, in their behalf, of Christian doctrine, or of deciding what is and what is not consistent with their several creeds. This is a high ecclesiastical function, which belongs only to ecclesiastical bodies. The Board cannot go behind the official judgment of the churches. If the Presbyterian church has pronounced a certain doctrine consistent with her standards, the Board cannot dismiss a Presbyterian missionary from their service, on account of holding or teaching that doctrine. Nor can they withhold their support from any mission church, under the care of a presbytery, for any cause which the Presbyterian church does not consider worthy of censure. If the members of the committee discover that the Presbyterian church holds doctrines, or tolerates usages, which they cannot with a good conscience help to sustain, the simple course is for them to resign. But if multitudes sympathize with them, then the fact is revealed that they and the Presbyterians can no longer unite in the missionary work. But it is clearly preposterous for the committee to profess to be agents of the Presbyterian church, (old or new), and yet refuse to be guided by the judgment of

that church. The New School General Assembly, as well as the old, has decided that such slaveholding as is tolerated in the mission churches of the Cherokees and Choctaws, is consistent with Christian character and fellowship. With what show of reason then can the Boston committee, the agents of these presbyterians, in disbursing presbyterian money, say it shall not be permitted? It is clear as day that so long as the Dutch, Presbyterian and Congregational churches unite in the work of missions, the Board has no right to withdraw their patronage from any man or church, on account of any doctrine or usage which those churches approve. And it is no less clear that the right to judge of the consistency or inconsistency of any doctrine or usage with the standards of those churches, rests not with the committee, but with the churches themselves. To deny either of these propositions, is to create a dictatorship at once. The effect of this misapprehension is clear throughout Mr. Treat's letter. The secretary summons before him ministers who are members of presbytery in good standing, interrogates them as to their opinions, their mode of teaching, and exercise of discipline. He lays down rules as to how that teaching is to be conducted, and the terms on which members are to be received into Presbyterian churches. He gives them to understand that the committee may "be constrained by the sacredness of the trust committed to them, to withhold that pecuniary aid it has given them, in past years, so much pleasure to afford."\* His sole legitimate authority, in the matter, was to ask, "Brethren, does your church approve of such and such teaching? and does it sanction such and such conditions of church-membership?" If the answer to those questions is affirmative, the matter is ended. The committee may be grieved, or they may be glad. Their private opinions are not to be in the least consulted in such cases. As to manner, the letter is unexceptionable. It is couched in the blandest terms. It was evidently penned with the determination that no word should grate on the most delicate ear. Nevertheless, it is perfectly Archbishopal in its tone.

\* That aid, however, is not given by the committee, but by the churches through the committee. A very important distinction. If given by the committee, it may be given at their discretion—but if given by the churches, it must be given according to their pleasure, i. e., to men and churches whom they approve.



It is written just as the "servant of servants" is wont to write ; or, to use a better illustration, as Paul wrote, when he said, "Wherefore, though I might be much bold in Christ to enjoin that which is convenient ; yet for love's sake I rather beseech thee, being such a one as Paul the aged." This is lovely and venerable from apostolic lips—but apostolic lips have long since been sealed in death. We do not in the least attribute the apostolic tone of this letter, to any thing in the personal feelings of its authors. We believe them to be good men, and as humble as the rest of us. It is due to their false apprehension of their position. They are not entrusted with the authority which they suppose belongs to them. So long as the ecclesiastical bodies, with which the missionaries and mission churches among the Cherokees and Choctaws are connected, are satisfied with their doctrine and discipline, the Prudential Committee have no more right to interfere in the matter than any other five gentlemen in Boston.

2. Our second objection to this letter is that it is inconsistent with the Special Report of the Prudential Committee. It agrees indeed with the Report in claiming the right to sit in judgment on the teaching of the missionaries, and to control it according to their own interpretation of the general creed of the churches. It differs, however, from it in another important principle. The Report says expressly, the Board is not "at liberty to withdraw its confidence from missionaries, because of such differences of opinion among them, as are generally found and freely tolerated in presbyteries, councils, associations and other bodies here at home." p. 17. This rule follows as a matter of course, from what is said on pp. 13, 14, as to the standard by which the Board proposes to judge of doctrine, viz. the articles of faith "generally received by the churches." It may enforce obedience in those things in which the churches are united, but not in those cases in which they are divided. This principle is on p. 14 expressly applied to slavery. "The admission of slaveholders into the apostolical churches" is said to be one of the points about which the churches differ. Hence "the Board," it is said, "may not undertake to decide, that this class of persons was certainly admitted to church-membership by the apostles, nor that they were excluded, in such a way as to have the effect on the missionaries of a statute, injunction, or scripture doctrine

in respect to the admission of such persons into churches now to be gathered in heathen nations where slavery is found." The committee, it is added, may reason, persuade, and remonstrate, but further, neither they nor the Board, are authorized to go. Now according to the interpretation, as far as we know, universally put upon this letter; according to what appears to us its necessary meaning, and according to the understanding of the missionaries themselves, this is precisely the question the committee undertake in this letter authoritatively to decide. It lays down the rule as to how slaveholders are to be dealt with, when they are to be received, and when rejected from the communion of the church. All this is done officially, and with authority, and with the intimation that the continuance of the connexion between the Indian churches and the Board, depends upon their acting agreeable to the instructions here given. If this be not the character of the letter it loses all its importance. If it is an unofficial letter of friendship, instead of a letter of instructions, why should it be so solemnly sanctioned by the committee, reported to the Board, and their decision respecting it looked to us as determining the ground the Board was hereafter to stand upon? It would be sad news for the abolitionists, but a great relief to the missionaries, and to the Christian public, to know that the Board renounces the right to forbid slave-holding in the mission churches on pain of losing their patronage. This, however, is not to be hoped for, if this letter expresses their views of their own authority. It expresses the sentiment of the committee on the whole subject of slavery, calls upon the missionaries to say whether they acquiesce in them, and are ready "to act in accordance with them." The committee, therefore, here undertake to decide a point disputed among the churches. It decides moreover in favour of the minority. It proposes a doctrine of church communion which no denominational church has been left to adopt. It was indignantly voted down by an overwhelming majority (hundreds to units) in the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland. It was rejected, after nearly three weeks debate, by the New School Assembly in Philadelphia. It is repudiated by the Dutch Reformed church, and by that branch of the Presbyterian church with which some of these mission churches are immediately connected. It is probably

rejected by four-fifths of all the educated converted men in the world. Yet this doctrine, in obedience to a comparative handful of clamorous fanatics, the official organs of one of the most influential benevolent institutions in the world, would force on the ministers and churches of Christ. It would be better for the committee to cut off their right hands, rather than cut off the Indian churches because they admit slaveholders to their communion. Not because of any pecuniary loss it may occasion, but because it cannot be done without a sacrifice of principle, without subjecting the church to public opinion, now violently this, and again violently that. We sincerely pray that the Board may be preserved from any such disastrous mistake.

3. Our third objection to this letter is, that it is pervaded by a false philosophy. This is no small evil. It is a recognised truth that the world is governed by ideas. The character of men is formed, their conduct determined, and their destiny decided, in no small degree, by definitions. It is the view which they take of the primary principles of moral and metaphysical truth, that governs their opinions and consequently their conduct. The false philosophy of this letter leads to wrong views of duty, and those wrong views of duty, to a course of measures which, if persisted in, must split the American Board to pieces, and, to the extent of its influence, facilitate first, the division of the American churches, and then the dissolution of the American Union.

The philosophy on which this communication is founded, is what is popularly called "the doctrine of expediency." It is that philosophy in which the words "right" and "wrong," lose their distinctive meaning, and become the mere synonymes of beneficial and injurious. It is a philosophy which makes the end sanctify the means, and teaches that an action may be externally wrong and internally right. This is the philosophy to which all the doctrines and directions of this letter owe their character. This, for example, is the origin of the distinction between "slavery and slaveholding;" between "the system and the persons implicated therein." The system is always sinful, but those who practice it may be innocent. "The continuance of the relation is wrong, but the master may stand acquitted in the sight of God, because he was influenced solely by benevolent motives. Just as the selling ardent spirits, in the days of our

common ignorance on the subject of temperance, was clearly wrong; and yet many good men, never imagining that they were acting contrary to the law of love, engaged in the traffic. The *external* character of an act is one thing; its *internal* character quite another thing. A man may conscientiously do that which is injurious in its tendency; as, on the other hand, he may, with a bad motive, do that which is innocent or beneficial in its tendency."

Such language necessarily supposes that right means beneficial, and wrong, injurious. No moral distinction is admitted, but only a difference as expedient or inexpedient. A thing being injurious may indeed be one reason why it would be wrong in any one voluntarily to do it, but to merge the distinction of right and wrong into that of expedient and inexpedient, subverts the foundation of morals and religion, and when logically carried out, leads to the greatest enormities. According to the doctrine of this letter, no matter what "the external character of an act" may be, it is innocent if done conscientiously or from benevolent motives. If this is so, then Paul was not to blame for persecuting the church, because he verily believed he was doing God service; he had no doubt that the interests of truth, of his nation, and of the world were involved in putting down what he regarded as an imposture. This doctrine exculpates all persecutors and inquisitors, the exterminators of the Waldenses and of the Peruvians, provided only they were conscientious, which was, as it regards many of them, no doubt the case. It is vain to argue this matter. No man can look the naked proposition in the face, that every thing is innocent to him who thinks it to be right. The very essence of the guilt of men, the very sum of their depravity is their thinking good evil and evil good. The Bible holds up to us coincidence of moral judgment with God as the ideal of perfection, and as the clearest evidence of alienation from him that we regard that to be right which he abhors. If an act may be externally wrong and internally right, then the assassination of Henry IV, from an earnest desire to rid the world of an evil, was right; and then the doctrine that the end sanctifies the means, must, in all its length and breadth, be admitted. The motive of an action is determined by the end in view. If that end be the good of society, the motive is benevolent, and no matter what the nature of the act, the



agent stands acquitted in the sight of God, because he is governed by benevolent motives. This is radically and lamentably false morality. No man can sin innocently. No man stands acquitted in the sight of God for doing what God forbids. If slaveholding is sinful, all slaveholders are sinners. If persecution is wicked, all persecutors are without excuse. If selling ardent spirits is wrong now, the good men who formerly engaged in the traffic sinned against God. The reason of this is plain. All moral truths contain their own evidence; evidence which no man can innocently reject. How preposterous would it be for men to talk of committing theft, murder, or drunkenness from benevolent motives. No man can screen himself at a human tribunal, much less at the bar of God, behind his motives. It is indeed a plain doctrine of the Bible, and a plain principle of morals, that some sins, by reason of several aggravations, are more heinous in the sight of God than others. But it remains true, nevertheless, that every sin deserves God's wrath and curse, both in this life and in that which is to come. The crimes of the heathen committed in their blindness, do not lose their nature as sins, though it will be far more tolerable in the day of judgment for them, than for many Christians. That sins may be greatly aggravated by the circumstances under which they are committed, and especially by the light enjoyed by the transgressor, is very different from the doctrine which holds a man innocent who conscientiously commits sin, or which teaches that a thing may be externally wrong and internally right.

Another evidence of the false philosophy of this letter, is found in the manner in which it speaks of the conduct of our Lord and his apostles in relation to slavery. It represents them as abstaining from the denunciation of sin, from motives of expediency. God, however, hates and every where and at all times, denounces all sin. Why were idolatry and covetousness denounced? They were far more prevalent than slaveholding; they were more influential and more deeply rooted, and yet no considerations of expediency constrained the apostles to silence, regarding them. It is an impeachment of the integrity of any teacher of morality to say that he avoided all denunciation of theft, murder and adultery from motives of expediency. No one

can think, without a shudder, of Christ and the apostles giving directions to thieves and drunkards how to treat their associates or victims. This doctrine that men's conduct in reference to moral questions, may be regulated by expediency, overlooks all moral distinctions. With regard to things indifferent, expediency is a very proper guide—but no truth can be plainer than that all sin should be everywhere denounced, and immediately forsaken.

To the same false principle are to be referred all the directions which this letter gives to the missionaries. Slaveholding is sinful, but you need not say so. You may choose your time. You may wait for suitable occasions. You may do it indirectly, when it would not answer to do it plainly. That all this is wrong is obvious. No such directions could be given with regard to any other sin. It would not do to say to the missionaries, you may take your own time to denounce robbery and murder. You may do it indirectly, &c., &c. The public are not so entirely blinded by a false philosophy, as not to see this is wrong. And we cannot but hope it may be given to the Prudential Committee, to see that there is something amiss in their theory. Either slaveholding is not a sin, or this is not the way to treat it.

From this same doctrine of expediency, from the doctrine that a thing may be externally wrong and internally right, flows the inquisitorial treatment of slaveholding converts here recommended; this prying into their motives in owning slaves, to determine whether they are selfish or benevolent. Is this the course pursued with regard to lying and theft? Is the poor convert cross-questioned as to his motives in cheating and stealing? We trow not. And why not? Simply because every one knows that cheating and slaveholding belong to very different categories. Lying and theft are sinful in themselves, and it matters not with what motives they are committed. If slaveholding is sinful, there is no need to enquire into a man's motives in sinning.

4. Our fourth objection to this letter is its want of discrimination and clearness. The writer gives us no distinct idea of what it is he condemns. He condemns slavery, but he does not tell us what he means by it. He seems to speak of it as a system which keeps men in degradation, which denies to them

a just compensation for labour; which disregards their rights as husbands and parents; which forbids their instruction, and debars them from access to the word of God. He sees, as every one else sees, that a system which does all this, must be sinful. It is a system which ought not to be dallied with, or assaulted indirectly, but should be openly denounced, and immediately abandoned by every good man. But these things are not slavery. They do not enter into its definition. It may, and in many cases does exist without one of these circumstances. Slavery is involuntary servitude. And servitude is the obligation to serve. This is all that is essential to slavery. It supposes the right on the part of the master to the service of the slave, without his consent. In every country where slavery prevails there are two sets of laws relating to it. The one designed to enforce this right of the master, to render it profitable, and to perpetuate it. The other intended to protect the slave. These laws vary continually. They were far more unjust in the French West India Islands, than in the British, and more unjust in the British, than in the Spanish. Laws made by slaveholders and intended to enforce, and to render secure and profitable their right to the service of their slaves, are almost always more or less in conflict with the gospel. So is all class legislation of any kind. In regard to these laws, it is the business of the church, by her instructions and discipline, to enforce such as are good and such as are indifferent, and to denounce such as are wicked. If the Roman law gave the power of life and death to the master, he was none the less a murderer, in the sight of the church, if he maliciously put his slave to death. If American law gives the master the power of punishment, he is none the less guilty in the sight of the church, for every act of cruelty. If the law allows the master to keep back from his slaves a due recompence for their labour; to debar them access to the means of grace, and especially from the word of God; he is not the less accountable to the church for every violation of the law of justice and mercy. Human laws allow to parents and husbands a power which they may dreadfully abuse. Yet the possession of that power is not itself sinful.

What we complain of is, that this letter makes no discrimination between slavery and slave laws; between the possession of

a master's power and the abuse of that power. The relation itself is pronounced "unnatural and sinful," when all the arguments tend to prove not the relation, but the abuse of it to be wrong. Christ and his apostles evidently regarded the possession of despotic power, whether in the state or the family, a matter of indifference, i. e., neither right nor wrong in its own nature, but the becoming one or the other according to circumstances. It was therefore not despotism in the state, or slaveholding in the family, which they condemned, but the wrong use of the authority of the despot or the master.

There is the same confusion with regard to the word "property." The letter says the converted slaveholder must repudiate the idea of having a right of property in a human being. Everything done on the assumption of such a right, is declared to be a proper matter for discipline. But not one word is said to inform us what this right of property is. Abolitionists say it is the right to make a man a thing, or a brute. If this is what is meant, will any one venture to say that Christ and his apostles, from motives of expediency, failed to denounce so great a sin as that? Neither lying nor stealing could be one half so offensive to God, as such an insult and degradation put upon his own image. No slave laws, however atrocious, ever proceeded on the assumption that a slave was not a rational being, of the same nature with his master. If this is what the letter means by the right of property, it is a mere chimera. The only sense in which one man can have property in another, is in having a right to his services. In this sense the state has the right of property in her citizens, a right which she often presses further than the slaveholder can press his power, when she forces men into her armies and navies, and sends them to die by pestilence or the sword.

These are subjects which we have repeatedly discussed at length, in the pages of this journal. We have no desire to travel again over the same ground. We have said enough to show the lamentable consequences of not discriminating things that differ; of confounding things lawful or indifferent, with things in their own nature sinful. If the noble letters written by the Cherokee and Choctaw missionaries, failed to open the eyes of the committee to this distinction, we despair of being



able to do it. Those letters show that the missions are faithful in this whole matter; dealing with the subject just as the scriptures treat it, condemning all that is sinful, and requiring all that justice or love demand, abstaining only from pronouncing, contrary to the scripture, and contrary to the judgment of nine-tenths of the people of God in all ages, "the relation itself to be unnatural and sinful."

There are several perfectly distinct and intelligible views of this whole subject of slavery, and of the proper method of dealing with it. The first is, that it is a good and desirable institution; a state of the labouring population, which upon the whole is preferable to any other. Appropriate means ought therefore to be taken to perpetuate and extend it. As however slavery is founded on the inferiority of one class of society to another, it cannot continue to exist unless that inferiority be perpetuated. Consequently, according to this view, slaves ought to be debarred from the means of improvement, and kept in a condition of intellectual and social debasement. This is the fanatical proslavery doctrine. It has been repudiated by all the great men of the south in the earlier periods of our history, and is probably not held by one educated man in a hundred, perhaps not by one in a thousand, in our slaveholding states.

The second view is, that the relation is unnatural and sinful, and should therefore be immediately and universally renounced, just like any other sin, drunkenness, lying, or theft. This is clear-headed, and straight-forward abolitionism.

The third is the scriptural view. Slaveholding, according to this view, belongs to the class of things indifferent, of things neither forbidden nor commanded in the word of God, which are right or wrong, according to circumstances. It is like despotism in the state. A man may possess despotic power in the state, power giving him authority over the persons and property of his fellow men. The abuse of such power is a great sin. To employ it with the view of perpetuating it, by keeping those under its control in a state of ignorance or debasement, is one of the greatest acts of injustice that one man can commit towards his fellows. But if that power be used justly and benevolently, its possession is no sin, and the despot may be one of the greatest benefactors of his race. Despotism, however, is not a desirable form of government, no means therefore ought

to be employed to perpetuate it. It is adapted only to a low state of civilization, and must disappear as the mass of the people increase in intelligence, property and virtuous self-control. It is just so with slavery or domestic despotism. A man may be a slaveholder without any impeachment of his Christian character. The relation in which he stands to his slaves is not a sinful one. It is not forbidden in the word of God. It may be the most appropriate and natural relation in which the parties can stand to each other. Just as despotism in some circumstances is the very best form of government. But such slaveholder is bound to use his power as a Christian, just as a parent or husband is bound to use his authority; or a rich man his wealth. He must act in obedience to the gospel, which teaches that the labourer is worthy of his hire, and that a fair compensation must in all cases be made to him; which forbids the separation of those whom God has joined in marriage; which requires all appropriate means to be used for the intellectual and moral improvement of our fellow men, and especially that free access should be allowed them to the word of God, and to all the means of grace. This is the gospel method of dealing with slavery. If this method be adopted, the inferiority of the one class to the other, on which slavery is founded, will gradually disappear, and the whole system be peacefully and healthfully abolished. This is the way in which the gospel has already banished domestic slavery from a large part of the Christian world. There are some men who are so blind they cannot see, or so wicked they will not acknowledge, the difference between this view and first above mentioned.

An unsuccessful attempt is sometimes made, as in this letter of Mr. Treat's, to find some middle ground between abolitionism, and what we have ventured to designate as the scriptural view of this subject. The principles of the abolitionists are admitted, but their conclusions are denied or modified. The system is sinful, but those who practise it may be innocent. The relation is wrong, but it need not be immediately abandoned. Being sinful, it affords *prima facie* evidence that those who are concerned with it, are not Christians. Before they can be properly recognised as such, they must prove they are influenced by benevolent motives, in doing what is "unnatural and sinful."\*

\* Mr. Goodell, the prominent New York abolition editor, says, When you

In all we have now written, we have been influenced by the most friendly feelings towards the American Board. We believe it has been an incalculable blessing to this country, and to the heathen world. We regard the interests of the Redeemer's kingdom as deeply involved in its prosperity. We think all Christians are bound to pray for its success, to avoid everything that can injuriously affect it, and to promote its efficiency, as God may give them the ability and occasion. We believe that the misapprehension, which in our judgment, characterizes the Report of the Prudential Committee, is perfectly natural, and entirely consistent with the purest intentions on their part. We believe, further, that the correction of that misapprehension, and the adoption of the principles we have endeavoured to sustain in this review, so far from impeding their operations, would tend directly to disembarass and facilitate them. The committee say they are directly responsible for the teaching of the missionaries. They must, therefore, have the right to know what it is, to judge and to direct it. The consequence is, their conscience is always on the alert. The opinions of the few gentlemen in Boston as to what is, and what is not, the faith and discipline of the church, become the rule by which all missionaries are to conduct their teaching, subject indeed to the revision of the Board. Hence, if the missionaries teach that slavery is not in itself sinful, and that slaveholding is not *prima facie* evidence of an unconverted state, and the committee think otherwise, and that the churches agree with them, they are bound to require the missionaries to conform to their views. According to the other view of the matter, the committee are not directly responsible for the teaching of the missionaries. That responsibility rests on the ecclesiastical body to which they belong. To that body, therefore, and not to the Committee, belongs the right of inquiry, judgment and direction. Consequently, so long as the denomination, with which a missionary is connected, approves of any doctrine or rule of discipline, the committee cannot interfere. If, for example, missionaries connected with the Presbyterian or Dutch church, with the approbation of those churches, admit slaveholders to the

convince an Old School man of sin, he will forsake it. But when you have convinced a New School man that a thing is sinful, you have still to satisfy him that it is expedient to abandon it.

communion, the committee are relieved from all responsibility. On the other hand, if missionaries connected with the Congregationalists, with the approbation of those entitled to judge, hold and teach that slaveholders should not be received, the committee are bound to acquiesce, as to the mission churches under Congregational control. By the Board and the churches keeping thus, in their separate spheres, we see not why there need be any collision between them.

---

ART. II.—*The Work claiming to be the Constitutions of the Holy Apostles, including the Canons; Whiston's version, revised from the Greek; with a Prize Essay at the University of Bonn, upon their origin and contents; translated from the German, by Iraha Chase, D.D. New York. D. Appleton & Co., 1848.*

It is justly remarked by Dr. Chase, in his preface to the work before us, that "in reading these Constitutions and Canons of the Apostles, the Christian of the present day will be likely to exclaim—a splendid specimen of pious fraud, a strange mixture of good and evil!" Viewing the work in the light of its own claims, as a pretended production of apostolic times, embodying a system of church discipline stamped with apostolic authority, it is indeed a remarkable "specimen of pious fraud." Still we hail its publication with pleasure, and think that Dr. Chase has done the church good service, by putting within the reach of the Christian student, and in a very convenient form, a work which hitherto has been almost inaccessible to the great mass of the Christian ministry in our country. There is, as we shall presently see, considerable diversity of opinion among the learned as to the age in which the Constitutions were framed; but whatever be the true date of their origin, there can be no doubt that the collection belongs to a remote Christian antiquity; and it is all the more precious from the fact that so few literary monuments of the earlier ages of the church have been preserved. It is a document of high value and importance for illustrating the ecclesiastical history of a very distant period,



during a part of which at least, paganism was the dominant religion, the sighing of Christian prisoners was heard, and the blood of Christian martyrs was flowing in abundant streams.

The present edition, which, by the way, is executed with singular elegance—consists of Whiston's translation of the Greek text of the Constitutions and Canons, revised by Dr. Chase, and an Essay, historical and critical, on their origin and contents, by Dr. O. C. Krabbe, characterized by that fulness of learned research for which the scholars of Germany are so eminent. The Constitutions themselves are divided into eight books, in which various topics are handled, not however in any thing like logical order; some of them being of a doctrinal cast, though they mostly refer to practical rules of life, ecclesiastical discipline, and forms of worship.

Among Romanist authors a wide diversity of judgment obtains respecting both the age and the authority of the Constitutions. Bovius, Turrian and Stapleton, who may be ranked among their strongest advocates, go the length of asserting that "they are full of the apostolic spirit," and that "if the church should receive them into the canon of scripture, she would have as much reason for holding them, as she has for holding the Epistle of James to be canonical." Bellarmine, on the contrary, while he makes frequent use of them in his defence of the Romish system, says decidedly that they are not the production of Clement, but belong to a later age. Baronius was of the same mind. Tillemont affirms that they were fabricated in the sixth century. Cotelierius, who published a noble edition of them, with a Latin translation, and numerous notes, is uncertain whether the author lived before or after the days of Epiphanius. With a few unimportant exceptions, Protestant writers agree in rejecting both the apostolic and the Clementine origin of the Constitutions. Blondell thinks that they were composed by the author of the *Recognitions*, about A. D. 180. Bishop Beveridge conjectured from a passage in the last canon, that they were written by Clement of Alexandria. Pierson supposes that, though they did not assume their present form until after the times of Epiphanius, they still exhibit substantially the instructions to the churches given by the Apostles,—by Barnabas, Clement of Rome, Ignatius and others of their contemporaries. The eccentric Whiston, however, far

outstripped all other Protestant and even Popish theologians, in the zeal with which he defended their claims, boldly maintaining that they form a part of the divine rule of faith and manners, and are nothing less than a collection of the laws which the Saviour gave his apostles during the period of forty days between his resurrection and ascension. He was opposed by Le Clerc, who endeavoured to prove that they were the work of an Arian of the age of Constantine. Ittig who has largely discussed the subject, and Usher unite in holding that they first became known in the course of the fourth century, and were afterwards corrupted by an Arian in the sixth. But of all the Protestant authors who have treated of the origin and merits of the Constitutions, the name of the great Daillé deserves to be mentioned with the highest respect, for to him belongs the honour of having proved most conclusively that they are the work neither of the apostles nor of the Roman Clement.

At the risk of being tedious we cannot forbear quoting the sentiments of one or two writers of more modern date. Schröckh says it is of less importance to know who was the author, than at what period he lived, and why he deceived the world. His judgment is that the work was composed by some unknown author under the heathen emperors, towards the end of the third or beginning of the fourth century. Starck says that if we collect and compare the traces of more ancient and more recent times, it becomes quite clear that the Constitutions are the productions neither of one man nor one age, but are a confused collection made here and there in the churches founded by apostles, of ecclesiastical laws, some of them old, some new, and which received the name they bear, simply because these churches were of apostolic origin.

The author of the historical Essay decidedly rejects the idea that the Constitutions were made up of sundry earlier documents, on the ground that no mention is made of any such documents by ancient writers, and that no remains of them have come down to us. He also maintains that the marked uniformity of the style precludes the supposition of more than one pen having been engaged in the composition. As to its age, he states that the external testimonies constrain us to seek for the origin of the work before the fourth century, a conclusion to which all the

internal evidences conduct us; while the Constitutions bear on themselves decisive proof that they must have been written towards the end of the third century. All their contents testify to this most strikingly; their form of public divine worship, their ritual and disciplinary institutions, the state of the teachers and subordinate officers of the church are so many witnesses to the truth of this averment. The whole internal and external form of the church as here portrayed, we find in the third century. In short they bear the strong impress of the age of Cyprian, and must have proceeded from the spirit, and have been designed to further the aims of that eminent man. To establish this position he goes into a minute and even tedious examination of the several books. He then discusses at much length the object of the author of the Constitutions. On this point he says, it is manifest from the nature of the case, that he must have had some plan whose accomplishment he deemed desirable and possible. His design seems to have been twofold, viz., to promote the unity of the church, and to establish a hierarchal form of government. The first of these objects he proposed to attain not by setting up a standard of doctrine or dogmatical canons, but rather an uniform system of discipline, ceremonies, and ecclesiastical arrangements. It was outward uniformity, and not unity in the scriptural sense of the word, at which he aimed,—not the unity which consists essentially in the being baptized into one spirit, and the being made partakers of a common divine life,—not the unity of believers, but the visible unity of a common usage. With this idea there was combined another, which may be traced throughout the entire work, viz., that the constitution of the Christian church is only an improved copy of the Jewish temple worship. In a word the author was a decided hierarchist, and his special purpose in getting up the Constitutions, and in palming them upon the world as the production of the Apostles, was the revival in the New Testament church of the laws and institutions of the ancient hierarchy.

From the above hasty summary of opinions, it will be seen that both Popish and Protestant theologians are greatly divided in judgment as to the age and author of this work; and that, on the whole, the latter class allow it a higher antiquity than the former. The views of Dr. Krabbe, who has examined the whole subject with so much thoroughness and care, are certain-

ly entitled to great weight, still, we must confess that his solution of this difficult historical problem does not completely satisfy us. We are inclined to regard the Constitutions, in the shape in which they have come down to us, as the work of more than one writer. The argument of Dr. Krabbe against this theory, founded on the uniformity of the style appears to us not to be of much weight, because the nature of the topics handled, is such as almost to preclude the possibility of a sensible diversity of style. Our statute book, for example, is the joint production of many men, yet no one would attempt to determine the authorship of its various chapters or enactments by the test of style, which, from the necessity of the case is uniform. So in the work before us, the absence of a varied style is no evidence of its being the production of a single author, for each succeeding contributor would naturally adopt the style of his predecessors. On Dr. Krabbe's theory, we cannot account for the numerous traces of Arianism which the Constitutions confessedly bear. If, as he maintains, the author belonged to the Cyprianic age, then it is quite obvious that those portions which savour of the Arian heresy must have been interpolated at a later period; and if the dogmatic character of the work has been changed, it is, to say the least, not improbable that other alterations or additions were made in those parts of it which refer to church usages and discipline. After all, the question whether one man or many men composed the Constitutions is more curious than important; their real value arises from the light they cast on the history and antiquities of the church, by showing what her condition was in the times when the authors lived.

In this point of view, though claiming to be what they are not, and assuming a name to which they have not the shadow of a title, they are of inestimable worth to the student of ecclesiastical history. The aim of their authors seems to have been to give a sort of apostolic sanction to rites and ceremonies to which the primitive Christians were strangers, and to incorporate with the constitution of the church certain hierarchal elements, for which not only can no warrant be found in the New Testament, but which are contrary to the whole spirit of the Christian dispensation. At the same time we find in these constitutions a considerable amount of pure and precious apos-



tolic truth. Thus in the opening chapter there is a description of the nature of the church of Christ, and of the great ends of her existence, as accurate as it is beautiful: "The catholic church is the plantation of God and his beloved vineyard, consisting of those who have believed in his unerring divine religion; who are heirs by faith of his everlasting kingdom; who are partakers of his divine influence, and of the communications of the Holy Spirit; who are armed and inwardly strengthened with his fear, through Jesus; who enjoy the benefit of the sprinkling of the precious and innocent blood of Christ; who have free liberty to call the Almighty God, Father, being fellow heirs and joint partakers of his beloved Son." Other passages might be quoted, embodying sound doctrine and pure morality, though none of them bear the marks of a very vigorous mind.

Instead, however, of enlarging on the dogmatical character of the Apostolical Constitutions, we propose to inquire—what is the form of government exhibited in them, and which, we may reasonably suppose, actually existed in the church at the period of their composition? We may here observe, that we do not wonder that the high-toned hierarchists of modern days, both Roman and Anglican, while making such ado about primitive order, and the authority of the primitive church, are so shy of a work on many accounts one of the most remarkable of the times to which it belongs. Its author or authors had clearly derived their ideas of the church from the ancient Jewish model; their manifest design is to establish a hierarchy; yet when we examine their work carefully, we discover a marked dissimilarity between the form of government portrayed in it, and all the existing platforms of prelacy; we meet with numerous statements respecting the ministry, which no hermeneutics can explain consistently with the hierarchal theory of Rome, Oxford, or New York. Of prelacy in the ordinary acceptance of the term, or the system which makes the bishop, the pastor not of a single congregation, but of a large number of them associated in the form of a diocese, no traces can be discovered in the Constitutions. In fact the counterpart of the platform of government which they exhibit is not to be found in any one of the existing forms of polity in the Christian church. Presbyterianism per-

haps comes the nearest to it, but they are not identical; in every regularly constituted congregation there was a bishop or pastor, there were presbyters and deacons; but the functions of the presbyter differed in some important respects from those of the ruling elder of the present day; and the duties of the deacon, though in the main the same as those discharged by deacons in Presbyterian congregations included some things which do not come within the province of the latter.

Let us then begin with the office of the Bishop. What were the duties of the bishop; did he stand in a direct or only indirect relation to the Christian people; was it his business to instruct them and exercise the discipline of Christ's house immediately, or through the agency of others; in other words, was he a parochial or a diocesan bishop? In reply to this inquiry, we say that he occupied the position and discharged the duties of a simple pastor of a congregation; and if our limits allowed it, we might quote a multitude of passages from the Apostolical Constitutions in which this fact is either expressly asserted, or clearly implied. For instance, Canon XL, (B. viii. p. 250) declares,—“Let not the presbyters and deacons do any thing without the consent of the bishop; for it is he who is entrusted with the people of the Lord, and will be required to give an account of their souls. We command that the bishop have power over the goods of the church; for if he be entrusted with the precious souls of men, much more ought he to give directions about goods, that under his authority they all be distributed by the presbyters and deacons to those in want.” Again, in chapter 1st of the same book, we find the following,—“Moreover let not a bishop be exalted against the deacons and the presbyters; nor the presbyters against the people, *for from each and all of these is the composition of the congregation.*” Words could hardly be more express. The directions concerning the election and ordination of a bishop are in precise accordance with this statement.” In the first place, therefore, a bishop to be ordained is to be unblameable in all things, a select person, *chosen by the whole people.* And when he is named and approved, let the people assemble, with the presbytery, and bishops that are present, on the Lord's day; and let them give their consent. And let him who is preferred among

the rest ask the presbytery and the people, whether this is the person whom they desire for their ruler. And if they give their consent, let him ask further, whether he has a good testimony from all men, as to his worthiness for so great and glorious an authority; whether all things relating to his piety towards God are right; whether justice towards men hath been observed by him; whether the affairs of his family have been well ordered by him. And if all the assembly together do, according to truth and not prejudice, testify that he is such a one, let them the third time, as before God the Judge, and Christ, the Holy Ghost also assuredly being present, and all the holy ministering spirits, ask again, whether he is truly worthy of this ministry. And if they agree the third time, that he is worthy, let them all be demanded their vote; and when they all give it willingly, let them be heard. And silence being made, let one of the principal bishops—the rest of the bishops and presbyters praying silently and the deacons holding the holy gospels open upon the head of him that is to be ordained—say to God;” then follows the form of prayer; we may add that neither in the prayer, nor in any other part of the chapter is imposition of hands spoken of. **B.** viii. p. 202. To these passages may be added what is said in the curious “description of a church and the clergy,” in which, the former and its officers are compared to a ship and her crew: “O Bishop, when thou callest an assembly of the church, as one that is the commander of a great ship, appoint the assemblies to be made with great skill; charging the deacons, as mariners, to prepare places for the brethren as for passengers with all due care and decorum. And first let the building be long, with its head to the east, its vestries on both sides at the east end, and so it will be like a ship. In the middle let the bishop’s throne\* be placed; and on each side of him let the presbytery sit down; and let the deacons stand near at hand; for they are like the mariners and managers of the ship. While the Gospel is read, let all the presbyters and deacons, and all the people stand up in great silence. In the next place let the presbyters one by one, and not all together exhort the people, and the bishop in the last place as being the commander.” **B.** ii. p. 70.

\* The original term simply means an official seat; and the sentence properly rendered would read “let the bishop’s chair be placed,” &c.

The direct relation of the bishop to the congregation, expressly declared in the passages already quoted, is also implied in the directions addressed to him, to teach and exercise discipline. "Be careful, therefore O Bishop, to study the word of God, that thou mayest copiously nourish thy people with much doctrine, and enlighten them with the light of the law." B. ii. p. 15. "For it becometh you, bishops, to be guides and watchmen to the people, as ye yourselves have Christ for your guide and watchman. For the Lord said by Ezekiel, speaking to every one of you: '*Son of man, &c.*' The trumpet is the holy Gospel, the watchman is the bishop, who is set in the church, who is obliged in his preaching to testify and vehemently to forewarn of that judgment. If ye do not declare and testify this to the people, the sins of those who are ignorant of it will be found upon you. Wherefore warn and reprove with boldness the perverse, teach the ignorant, confirm those that understand, bring back those that go astray." B. ii. p. 17. "The bishop is the minister of the word, the keeper of knowledge, the mediator between God and you in the several parts of your divine worship. He is the teacher of piety; and next after God, he is your father, who hath begotten you again to the adoption of sons by water and the Spirit." B. ii. p. 43. "Do not thou, O Bishop, immediately abhor any person who hath fallen into one or two offences, nor shalt thou exclude him from the word of the Lord, nor reject him from common intercourse; as thou receivest a heathen, after thou hast instructed and baptized him, so do thou let all join in prayers for this man, and restore him by imposition of hands to his ancient place among the flock, as one purified by repentance." B. ii. p. 54, 55.

To these passages, we might were it requisite add many others of similar import. Nor is it necessary to comment on those we have quoted; they speak for themselves. The directions addressed to the bishop to preach the gospel, to exercise a constant and minute supervision of the people committed to his charge, for whose souls he is especially responsible, and to administer the discipline of Christ's house, plainly indicate that his charge was precisely equivalent to that of a modern pastor. Every unprejudiced reader must feel that it would be perfectly preposterous to give directions like these, for instance, to the bishop of London—or of New York, or in fact to any diocesan



prelate, unless (as is commonly the case with Scottish and American prelates) he is at the same time the rector of a particular parish. Did it fall in with our present design, we could adduce evidence of the same kind, in support of this position from the epistles of the Apostolic fathers, Clement, Polycarp, and Ignatius, who lived long before the author of the Constitutions; and likewise from Bingham's lists of the bishoprics in the early church. In all these documents, facts and circumstances are detailed, which it is impossible to account for, except on the supposition that the relations of a primitive bishop were just those of a modern pastor. There is only one passage in the work before us that seems to conflict with the preceding statements, to overlook which might appear uncandid; it is as follows: "We have heard from our Lord that a pastor who is to be ordained a bishop for the churches in every parish must be blameless—and not under fifty years of age." B. ii. p. 12. Such is Whiston's rendering of it, and it seems to imply that "*the parish*"—παροικία—was equivalent to a diocese, and included many distinctly organised congregations. This inference would not be a fair one, in the face of so many other passages of directly opposite import, even if we were quite sure that the reading in this place is genuine. But there is reason to believe that the words—εἰς τὰς ἐκκλησίας—have been interpolated. Cotelerius, who, by the way, renders the phrase in question—"in aliqua ecclesia et parœcia," declares that the interpolation of single words and expressions are very numerous, while at the same time it is impossible to detect them. Romanist though he was, his own rendering of the passage, shows that he was somewhat suspicious of its genuineness, or at all events, that in his judgment, the existence of diocesan prelacy could not be fairly concluded from it.

The next point of inquiry respects the office of *Presbyter*. It is evident from various passages in the Apostolic Constitutions, that, in every congregation fully organised, there was a *bench of Presbyters*—a presbytery. While the bishop is always spoken of as holding his position alone, the presbyter is as invariably represented as forming one of a college. "If any determine to invite elder women to an entertainment—let what is the pastor's due, be set apart in the feast for him; let a double portion be set apart for the presbyters, as for those who labour

about the word and doctrine." B. ii. p. 45. "The deacon is to minister to the bishop and to the *presbyters*, and not to meddle with the other offices." B. ii. p. 93. "Moreover let not the bishop be exalted against the deacons and the presbyters; nor the Presbyters against the people; *for from each and all of these is the composition of the congregation*. B. ii. p. 199. "If a brother or sister come from another parish, bringing commendatory letters, let the deacon inquire whether they are faithful, of the church, not defiled by heresy; when he is satisfied in these questions, let him conduct every one to the place proper for him. If a presbyter come from another parish, let him be received to communion by *the presbyters*; if a deacon by the deacons; if a bishop, let him sit with the bishop, and be allowed the same honour with himself." B. ii. p. 71, 72.

The difference between the bishop and the presbyter of the Constitutions is nowhere precisely and formally stated; yet it is plain that the former was more than *primus inter pares*, for it is expressly declared that "sacred offices are conferred by the laying on of the hands of the bishop." "We do not permit presbyters, but only bishops, to ordain deacons or deaconesses, or readers, or servants," &c. B. iii. p. 87. In the prayer appointed to be used at the ordination of a presbyter (which was to be held "in the presence of the presbyters and deacons") the following language occurs: "O Lord Almighty, do thou thyself now look upon this thy servant, who is *put into the presbytery* by the vote and determination of the whole clergy.\* And do thou replenish him with the spirit of grace and counsel *to assist and govern thy people* with a pure heart." B. viii. p. 224. This agrees with the account elsewhere given of the presbytery as being "the counsellors of the bishop; the sanhedrim and senate of the church." B. ii. p. 45. Each presbyter was invested with authority "to teach,† to offer (i. e. administer the Lord's Supper)

\* The term clergy as used in the Apostolic Constitutions includes all who were in any way connected officially with the congregation—bishop, presbyters, deacons, deaconesses, readers, singers, porters, servants. See B. iii. p. 87.

† As to the preaching of presbyters. different rules obtained in different parts of the church. Thus Possidius mentions in his life of Augustine that while he (Augustine) was a presbyter, the bishop gave him power "*coram se in ecclesia evangelium praeedicandi—contra usum ac consuetudinem Africarum ecclesiarum. Postea porro praecedente exemplo, accepta ab episcopis potestate, presbyteri nonnulli coram episcopis populo tractare coeperunt verbum Dei.*" We may also state,

to baptize, and to bless the people," (B. iii. p. 93); though in ordinary circumstances the performance of these offices devolved upon the bishop, as the pastor of the congregation. When he was present, or rather in the usual weekly assemblies of the congregation, it was customary for several of the presbyters, in succession to exhort the people, before the delivery of the sermon by the bishop. Thus in the chapter in which the Christian congregation is compared to a ship, directions are given as to the order in which the books of scripture are to be read, and the conduct of the presbyters, deacons and people" while the gospel is read; "In the next place, let the presbyters, *one by one*, not altogether, exhort the people, and the bishop in the last place as being the commander of the ship." B. ii. 70.

We come next to the office of the *Deacon*. He was one of the clerical order, as has been already shown, in common with the porter, and the lamplighters, but is nowhere styled a priest; nor is the office anywhere represented as forming one of the orders of the priesthood. It is perfectly obvious from the most cursory inspection of the Constitutions that there was in every properly organized congregation a *bench of Deacons*, as well as of presbyters. On this point it is needless to multiply quotations, as it is sufficiently evident from those already made. The *duties* of the deacon appear to have been very various; and hence he is much more frequently mentioned in the Constitutions than the presbyter. He was the bishop's "minister;" or the organ through which he obtained information of what was passing among the people of his charge, and the medium of communication with the poor and needy. "Let the deacon order such things as he is able, by himself, receiving power from the bishop. But the weighty matters, let the Bishop judge. But let the deacon be the bishop's ear, and eye, and mouth, and soul, and heart, that the bishop may not be distracted with many cares, but with such only as are considerable." B. II. p. 59. "Let both the deacons and the deacon-

that in the 4th and beginning of the 5th century, we find in North Africa traces of an order of officers called *seniores plebis* of which no mention is made in the Constitutions. Augustine repeatedly refers to them. Optatus, De Schis. Donat. p. 168, says "Omnes vos episcopi, presbyteri, diacones, *seniores*." "Adhibite Conclericos et *Seniores plebis*," p. 169. They were not clerical presbyters, but held a middle position between the clergy and the laity. They were in fact the representatives of the latter. See Guerike's Lehrbuch der christ. kirch. Archaeologie. P. 42.

nesses be ready to carry messages, to travel about, to minister and serve." B. III. p. 92. It was his business, as appears from a passage already quoted, to look after those who had recently come within the bounds of the congregation, to receive their letters of commendation, to examine into their principles and character, and in the event of their admission to membership to assign them their proper places in the church.

Again in the assemblies for public worship, the deacons discharged various offices. "Let the deacons stand near at hand, (i. e., the bishop and the presbytery), in close and small girt garments;\* for they are like the mariners and managers of the ship." B. II. p. 69. They were the disposers of places, "that every one of those who came in might go to his proper place, and not sit at the entrance"—"if any one be found sitting out of his place, let him be rebuked by the deacon, as a messenger of the foreship." It devolved also on them to "oversee the people, that no one may whisper, nor slumber, nor laugh, nor nod." Sometimes a deacon read "the lessons from the gospels," while another "prayed for the whole church, for the whole world, and the several parts of it, and the fruits of it." They also assisted in the administration of the Lord's Supper, performing those services which are now rendered by ruling elders. "After the prayer (of consecration) is over, let *some* of the deacons attend upon the oblation of the eucharist, ministering to the Lord's body. Let *others* of *them* watch the multitude and keep them silent." B. II. p. 71. Not a word, however, is said about either their preaching sermons of their own, or reading the homilies of others. But one of their principal duties was the taking care of the poor; yet even in the discharge of this office they were directed to keep themselves in constant communication with the bishop. They must do nothing in the way of relieving the necessities of the afflicted without the knowledge and express warrant of the bishop; and the reason assigned for this of itself affords decisive evidence that he was the pastor of an

\* Whether the "close and small girt garment" was the official habiliment of the deacon, does not appear. This, however, is the only place in which the deacon's dress, official or otherwise, is referred to. Of the bishops and presbyter's robes no account is given; not the most distant allusion is made to the official dress of these officers, in the Constitutions, or even in the Canons, where we might expect to meet some reference to badges of office of this sort, if any such had existed at the time.



ordinary congregation. "Let not the deacon do anything at all without his bishop, nor give anything without his consent. For if he give to any one as to a person in distress, without the bishop's knowledge, *he will give it so that it must tend to the reproach of the bishop*, and will accuse him as careless of the distressed." "If, therefore, O deacon, thou knowest any one in distress, *put the bishop in mind of him, and so give to him*; but do nothing in a clandestine way, lest thou raise a murmur against him," B. II. p. 47.

There are a few other inferior offices incidentally mentioned, such as that of the reader, the porter, and the deaconess, who performed toward those of her own sex certain duties, which, with the views and in the state of society then existing, could not be so suitably discharged by men. All these officers are included by the authors of the Constitutions under the general name of the *clergy*; but as their functions are not particularly described, and if they do not appear to have taken any share in the government of the church, they may be dismissed without further notice. There is, however, a canon on the subject of councils or synods, which should not be passed over, viz., the 38th, which is as follows, "Let a council of bishops be held twice in the year; and let them ask one another the doctrines of piety; and let them determine the ecclesiastical disputes that happen; once in the fourth week of Pentecost, and again on the 12th of October." As both the Constitutions and the canons have confessedly come down to us in a vitiated text, it is quite possible that the one just quoted, originally provided for the presence of others beside bishops, in these semi-annual synods, perhaps for the *seniores plebis*, or the representatives of the people. But taking it as it stands, it reveals a fact of great importance respecting the government of the early church. We may fairly infer from the frequency with which these synods met that their members lived near each other, and therefore must have been pastors of congregations. It is obvious, moreover from the express terms of the canon, that the synods then held were not advisory councils, but courts of judicature. It also appears from the 37th canon, that these synods had jurisdiction not only over bishops, but likewise over presbyters and deacons; for this canon provides that—"If any bishop that is ordained do not undertake his office, nor take care of the people committed

to him, he shall be suspended until he do undertake it; and in like manner, a presbyter and a deacon. But if he go, and be not received because of the ill temper of the people, let the *clergy of that city be suspended* because they have not taught that disobedient people better.”

Such then is an outline of the form of government set forth in the Apostolic Constitutions, and which must have existed in the church during the period when their author or authors lived. Each congregation was under the care of its *bishop*, who was the pastor of the people, not indirectly, like a modern diocesan bishop, but immediately; on whom especially devolved the duty of preaching the word, administering the sacraments, exercising discipline, ascertaining and providing for the wants of the poor, in short, just that work with which an ordinary pastor in the present day is occupied. Next to the bishop was the *presbytery* or *the bench of presbyters*, who collectively constituted his council, while each of them, under his direction, had authority to exhort, preach, and administer the sacraments. And finally, there were the *deacons*, who discharged a multitude of subordinate officers, as the servants of the bishop, the supervisors of the people when met for public worship, and the overseers of the poor. Though this system, at the period referred to, appears to have obtained in most of the countries in which the church had gained a footing, we do not believe that it was universal. In the churches of North Africa it probably existed in a somewhat modified form. Even in apostolic times, there is reason for thinking—if we take all the testimony scriptural and ecclesiastical into account—that the platform of government was not precisely the same in all parts of the church,\* and if so, we might expect to find the same circumstantial diversity long after the decease of the apostles.

It may be asked, is not the scheme of government exhibited in the Apostolic Constitutions, *Prelacy*? To this question we reply,—if the essence of prelacy be understood to consist in the want of parity among church officers, then the scheme under consideration was one of the various forms in which prelacy may exist; for although, the porter, the servant, the reader,

\* Our readers may not agree with us in this remark; but it seems to us that there was a difference, slight indeed, but still a difference, between the constitution of the church of Philippi, and the church of Jerusalem.

the deaconesses and the deacon were not "ministers of the word," they were all clerics, in the sense in which the term was then used; they were all ordained to office by the imposition of hands; and of course in the clerical order there were as many ranks as there were offices between those of the pastor and the porter. In the elevation of the bishop above the presbyter, and placing in his hands the sole power of ordination, in the large increase of clerical offices, and in the so strongly marked distinction between the clergy and the laity, we recognise so many departures from the simplicity of apostolic times. We discover in all parts of the work before us evidences that the process of declension begun under the eyes of the apostles themselves, had made great progress, affecting every portion of the constitution of the church, doctrine, discipline, worship and government. It does not fall in with our design to inquire what form of government the first preachers of the gospel established, nor to discuss the question whether the church in all ages is bound to conform herself to this precise model, without the least modification; whatever may be the true answers to these questions, it seems perfectly obvious to us that the system of government existing in the second or third or fourth century must have diverged in a greater or less degree from that founded by the apostles, for the reason mentioned above—the gradual but constant declension of the church from primitive purity. To say that the constitution of the ministry remained intact, while ministers were becoming more and more ambitious and worldly, while the faith and worship of the church were being slowly corrupted by heresy and superstition is to affirm the opposite of what is declared by all the analogies of history.

Although the scheme of government portrayed in the Constitutions and Canons may be termed in a certain sense, prelatic, it does not follow that modern *jure divino* prelacy can derive support for its claims from this fact. On the contrary, the views every where given of the relations, and duties of bishop, the presbytery, the deacons are totally inconsistent with the supposition that prelacy as it now exists, existed then, as those who adopt the high *jure divino* principle are bound to show. To argue that the two systems are entirely or even substantially the same, because of an identity of name is sheer sophistry. When we examine into the relations and the duties of the an-

cient bishop, or prelate if you will, and of the ancient deacon we find that they discharged very different functions from those belonging to the officers bearing the same name under prelacy as it now exists. The one was congregational; the other diocesan prelacy. The ancient bishop was a pastor of the *people*, bound to instruct and watch over them in person. The modern bishop, as a bishop, is the pastor of his *clergy*, and has nothing to do directly with the people. The ancient deacon, though called a clergyman, in common with all officially connected in any way with the church, was not a minister of the word, but a helper of his pastor in managing "the outward business" of the congregation. The modern prelatial deacon is an incipient minister of the word, holding a position whether viewed in his relation to "his ordinary," or to the Christian people entirely different from that of his ancient name-sake. We are quite ready to admit that congregational prelacy was gradually expanded into—perhaps we may say, prepared the way for—diocesan, after the ancient paganism had been laid low, and the church was united with the state; but this result is far from showing that the systems are identical; the utmost that it can prove is that there were certain moral affinities between them. If prelacy in its present form could be contracted again to its ancient dimensions, we apprehend there are many even among presbyterians, who would look upon the difference between that system and their own as hardly worth contending about. The prelacy of the Constitutions, so far as its outward form is concerned bears a much closer resemblance to presbyterianism, than to any other system—(though when accurately compared we find a material dissimilarity between them,) and this fact is as it seems to us, an important element in the historical argument to prove that the general principles of presbyterianism were practised in the earliest and purest times of the church.

In conclusion, we beg to say that we hail with real pleasure the re-publication of this venerable monument of Christian antiquity. The pastor, and the student of theology are thus enabled to avail themselves of original sources of information, in prosecuting their inquiries respecting the internal state and condition of the church during a period when her voice is supposed by multitudes to be as authoritative as that of her Divine Master himself. The study of the Constitutions may neither beget nor



strengthen the conviction in the reader's mind that the presbyterian system is in all its parts *jure divino*; but if it be prosecuted with any measure of candour, we are perfectly certain that it will produce the persuasion that the modern *jure divino* prelatist who makes so much ado about the practice and testimony of antiquity, must stand self-condemned, for having departed so widely from what, on his principles, is the true and unalterable model of the church.

---

### ART. III.—*The History of Catechizing.*

AMONG the works of Augustine, as scholars well know, is one on *Catechizing*.\* It was written at the request of a Carthaginian deacon, named Deogratias. Now though it is not pretended that those who were contemplated in this instruction were children, or that the work was done by question and answer, yet when it is considered that the catechumens who came from heathenism were only children of a larger growth, often rudely ignorant, it will be readily believed that this book of the excellent bishop contains useful lessons for ourselves. The Carthaginian friend had lamented to him the hardness and tediousness of the work; and much of Augustine's treatise is intended to prevent this, and to show him how he may shed a most attractive cheerfulness over the whole business of catechizing. These advices are just as applicable to the catechist of modern times. "Remedies," says he, "are to be sought of God, whereby this narrowness of spirit may be enlarged, that so we may exult in fervour of soul, and take delight in the tranquillity of a good work: for the Lord loveth a cheerful giver." He urges his correspondent to come cheerfully to the duties of teaching, however annoying, by adducing the example of Christ, and even of human nurses, who reduce the infant's food to the minutest portions, that the child may be able to receive it.

Who that has ever taught a class of children or youth does

\* *De Catechizandis Rudibus.*

not perceive that such advices as those which follow proceeded from experience? "If we grow weary of saying over things which are hackneyed and fit for babes, let us come close to them by fraternal, paternal, maternal love, and when thus joined to them in heart, we shall find even the old things seem new. For such is the power of sympathy, that when they are affected by our speaking, we also are affected by their learning, and thus the influence is mutual: so, in a manner, they speak the things which they hear us say, and we learn the things which we are teaching. Do we not find it thus, in regard to certain spacious and beautiful places, in city or country, which we have been accustomed to pass by without any pleasure, but which, when we exhibit to friends who have never beheld them, we contemplate with all the charm of novelty? And this the more, the more they are our friends: such being the bond of friendship, that the more we love them, the more do the old things become new. But if we have made a little proficiency in the contemplation of things, we shall not wish those whom we love to be astonished and delighted by the works of men's hands; but we desire to lift them to the plan and design of the author, and thence to rise to admiration and praise of the all-creating God, where we have the end of a love the most fertile. How much more ought we to delight, when any approach to learn about God himself, for whose sake all things are to be learned; and how ought our old instructions to grow fresh, by sympathy with their feeling of novelty?" These are expressions of our common nature, though uttered fourteen hundred years ago. And what is their principle? That warm love, and tender sympathy with the young, will make all the repetitions and labours of catechizing delightful.

Augustine lays down rules for arousing the attention of the careless, which are just as seasonable in a mission-assembly or in a parochial school, as in ancient Carthage or Hippo. And when all means, of narrative, of sudden question, of gentle remark are exhausted, and the learner is still hardened and averse, he says, we must "rather speak concerning him to God, than concerning God to him."\*

So much in earnest is Augustine, that he gives a specimen,

\* "*Magisque pro illo ad Deum, quam illi de Deo multa dicenda.*" §. 18.

running through a number of chapters, of the sort of instruction which a Catechist of that day might give to a gentile, who should come for instruction. And then he goes over the same, under a shorter form.

The researches of the learned have brought many interesting things to light respecting the apostolical and primitive Catechizing. Professor Walch, of Jena, has treated this subject: we venture to present a few gleanings from his rich harvest.\*

The word *catechize* is almost Greek. The original verb occurs often in the New Testament, but in different senses. In Acts xxi. 21, it means "to learn anything by common report;" in Rom. ii. 18, Gal. v. 6, 1 Cor. xiv. 19, "to be taught about religion;" in Luke i. 4, and Acts xviii. 25 "to initiate in Christian rudiments." The word is so used also by early church-writers.

This was not new among Hebrew Christians. When in Gen. xviii. 19, God says that Abraham will *command* his household, the word implies some previous instruction as to the nature of the command. Deut. i. 1-6, is an ordinance of catechizing, for all ages; so also, Ex. xii. 26, the rule about instructing children in the meaning of the passover.†

The apostles employed simple teaching, that is catechetical instruction: *I have fed you with milk*, says Paul to the Corinthians; and Clement of Alexandria applies this to catechizing. Such summaries as are found in Heb. vi. 1, were by the ancients called *catechetical*, by way of pre-eminence.

The persons submitted to this mode of instruction were called *Catechumens*. They were generally as has been already said, adults, but they were in knowledge no better than children. So they are expressly called, in Scripture; Heb. v. 13, 14. Paul divides Christians into adults and children or babes, who must be fed with infant's food. So also, 1 Cor. iii. 1, "And I, brethren, could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal, even as unto *babes* in Christ." Apollos, though a learned Alexandrian Jew, and a man of eloquence, was, in a sort, a Catechumen. "This man was instructed (*catechized*, the word is) in the way of the Lord," and a little after, "Knowing only the baptism of John:" he was therefore an unbaptized learner,

\* *Miscellanea Sacra*. See a translation in *Biblical Repertory* for 1827, p. 37 ff.

† See also Deut. xii. 19. Josh. iv. 6, vii. 22, 24, 15. 1 Sam. i. 25. Ps. lxxviii. 4, 5.

a Catechumen. That excellent woman, Priscilla, and her husband, Aquila, took him "and expounded unto him the way of the Lord more perfectly." Some think that the "form of sound words," which Paul recommends to Timothy, (2 Tim. i. 13) was some little compend or syllabus of catechetical instruction. It is the better opinion, however, that the apostles left nothing of this kind in writing. We must not ascribe everything to the first age, which we find in use a little later. "Let it not be supposed," says a learned writer, "that the same kind of catechetical instruction was used in the time of the Apostles, which obtained in later ages, especially in the fourth and fifth centuries, when the catechumens were divided into distinct grades and classes. For in that first age of Christianity, when the gospel was preached by the Apostles themselves, many extraordinary and miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit were enjoyed, and especially that peculiar gift, conferred on the apostles, of trying the spirits, whether they were of God."\*

The method of question and answer is not essential to catechizing, as is vulgarly thought, but is nevertheless closely connected with it, and of great importance. Here may be cited the celebrated Hoornbeek, one of the greater lights of Presbyterian Holland, in the seventeenth century. "The questions, the manner of examining, and the explanation, ought to be conformed to the capacity of the catechumens and hearers, (Prov. xxii. 8, Isaiah viii. 2) so that all things may be done with simplicity and perspicuity, for the edification of all; therefore the first and principal study of the catechist is, to be able to interrogate with dexterity (Luke ii. 46), so to propose and vary his questions, that the mind may be insensibly directed to the answer, and may scarcely avoid seeing it; and nothing is so necessary to this end, as to let down the manner of proposing questions to the capacity of children. *It is more important to interrogate properly than to explain*; for the former enters into the very nature of the catechesis, and the whole answer follows more or less readily, according as the question has been more or less clearly proposed."†

It was at a period subsequent to that of the apostles, that the regular Catechumens came into notice. These were they,

\* Van Dale, *Historia Baptismorum*, p. 416.

† Hoornbeek: *Misc. Sacra*, l. i. c. 12.



whose religious proficiency was not yet enough to warrant their reception into the church. They were also called *Auditores* or Hearers. They might attend the reading and preaching of the church-service, but not the communion. The time of this probation differed with the individual; but the Council of Elvira ordained that it should not be less than two years. Origen speaks of two classes. those who only received private instruction, and those who frequented assemblies, and were approaching baptism.

Those who gave special instruction to these candidates were called *Catechists*. In Carthage and Alexandria, it was thought important to seek out men of knowledge and prudence, if possible also of learning, who might be able to contend with the Gentiles, and resolve their doubts. What is called the Apostles' Creed was probably framed for the use of catechumens. The whole theology of the Grecian world was affected by the famous normal SCHOOL OF CATECHISTS, at Alexandria. Of its origin Neander can find no trace. Among its distinguished teachers, who gave fame to the institution, were Pantaenus, Clements Alexandrinus, Origen, Heraclas, and Dionysius. Origen, when eighteen years of age, was a catechumen at this school. Clement of Alexandria was one of these catechists.\*

It would be lost labour to endeavour to trace catechetical instruction through the Dark Ages. After all the ingenious efforts of Maitland and others, to show that they were more full of light than our own, it is hard not to perceive, that they were more concerned with legends, martyrologies, rosaries, feasts, and relics, than with any solid instruction. Here and there, however, we find attention drawn to the matter. At the Council of Tours, A. D. 1313, and at the second of Mentz, there were decrees enjoining the religious teaching of the young; the same order occurs in the capitulary of Charlemagne. In all these it was ordained that the instruction should be given in the vulgar tongue. From these decrees, and from other documents, we learn what constituted the body of catechetical instruction in that day. It comprised the Ten Commandments, the Apostles' Creed, and the Lord's Prayer; though sometimes one of the three is omitted. Instead of the Commandments, we find an

\* Neander, I. p. 900. Eusebius V. 10.

enumeration of capital sins. It was out of regard to the time-honoured usage, in this respect, that the early Reformers followed the same order in their Catechism. There is a specimen of middle-age labours, in this line, extant in the Weissenberg Theotisc Catechism of the ninth century.\* This contains the Lord's Prayer with an exposition, the capital sins, the Athanasian and Apostles' Creed, and the doxology "Glory to God in the highest." Some have attributed this little work to Rabanus Maurus, who is known to have been much concerned about the training of youth. Eccard, the editor of the book, refers it rather to Ottfried, a monk of Weissenberg, and scholar of Rabanus. But the reign of scholastic theology and the plague of superstition brought all labours of this kind to an end. It is only in flourishing periods of Christianity, that Christ's lambs are duly fed. Hence whenever any witnesses for the truth arose, they invariably turned their attention to catechetical instruction. Thus one of the crimes laid to the charge of the Waldenses, was that they gave instruction to one another. From the Catechism which the Waldenses presented to Francis I, King of France, in 1545, it appears that they had not neglected this branch of evangelical labour. The same proved true under John Wiclif, who set himself to make simple books of instruction for the poor people. John Huss, likewise, wrote a catechetical work, while he was in prison at Constance: it is to be found among his printed works, in the edition of 1715. It is no more than just to add that the great Gerson, chancellor of the University of Paris, not only wrote a treatise concerning "the drawing of babes to Christ," but spent much of his latter days in carrying his principles into practice.†

The Reformation in the sixteenth century was accompanied by the restitution of catechetical labour. Only a shadow of this instrumentality remained. It was to remedy the brutish ignorance of the German people, that Luther prepared his celebrated catechisms. Of these works we propose to speak more particularly in another place. "The wretched aspect of things," says he, "lately beheld by me in making a visitation, has impelled me to issue this catechism, composed with all brevity and plainness. Alas! what calamity did I then see! The common

\* *Buddens, Isagoge* p. 333.

† *Buddens, p. 334.*

people, especially they who dwell in the country, are so void of knowledge, that it were a shame to tell of it."

Among many generous traits in the heroic Luther, few are more striking than his zeal for the training of the young. He seemed to be before his age, in discerning that on this depended the existence of Protestantism. In 1525 he issued an "Address to all the Magistrates and Common Councils in all cities of Germany, in behalf of Public Schools." The learned historian von Raumer says of this treatise: "Who can avoid being delighted, to become acquainted with this great man as the reformer of German education? His admonitions went to the hearts of innumerable Germans, roused sleeping consciences, and strengthened weak hands: his decisions had, both with princes and people, the cogency of God's own voice."\* Some of Luther's rugged, earnest, mighty sentences, will not lose all their force, even in our imperfect translation.

"I entreat you all, therefore, dear masters and friends, on God's behalf, and on behalf of the poor youth, that you would not treat this matter so lightly, as many do, who see not the devices of the Prince of this world. For it is a serious and great affair, important to Christ and all the world, that we help and counsel the young. Dear masters, if one must spend so much yearly, on firelocks, roads, bridges, dams, and numberless like things, in order that a city have temporal peace and quietness, why should we not all the rather lay out as much on the poor youth, so as to have a few fit men for schoolmasters?" Is it not plain, that one can now in three years train a boy, so that in his fifteenth or eighteenth year, he shall know more than hitherto all universities and convents could do? Yea, what hath been learned hitherto in universities and convents, but to be asses, blocks and stocks? Twenty, even forty years have men learned in them, without knowing either Latin or German; to say nothing of the scandalous, vicious lives, whereby noble youth have there been so wofully corrupted."

"God's command by Moses presses and exacts the teaching of children by parents, so often, that in the 78th Psalm it is said: 'he commanded our fathers, that they should make them known to their children, and to children's children.' And the

\* Karl von Raumer, *Gesch. d. Paedagogik*, 1. 189.

fourth\* commandment shows this also, where God so earnestly commands obedience to parents, that rebellious sons were to be judicially slain. And why indeed do we elder ones live, but that we may guard and teach and train the younger?" "Wo to the world, for ever more! Here are children daily born and growing up, and alas! there is none to take charge of the poor young generation; so things are suffered to go as they may." "How can even reason, and especially Christian love endure it, that children grow up among us, untutored, and are poison and vermin-eggs to other children, till at last a whole city is corrupted, as befell Sodom, and Gomorrah, and Gaba! In the second place, alas the great mass of parents is unfit for the work, and know not how children should be brought up. For they have learnt nothing themselves, but to care for appetite."

"Our schools," adds Luther, with a noble warmth, "are no longer a hell and a purgatory, in which we were tortured upon *Casualibus* and *Temporalibus*; in which moreover we learned nothing but mere nought, after all our thumping, quaking, anguish and woe. If people take all this time and pains to make their children play cards, sing and dance, why not as much time to teach them reading and other arts, when they are young and at leisure, and fit and cheerful for it? I speak for myself. If I had children, and could do so, I would make them learn not only languages and history, but singing and instrumental music, and all mathematics. For what were all this but child's play, in which the Greeks in old time trained their children, so that they came to be marvellously expert, and afterwards fit for everything? Yea, it grieves me now, that I did not read the poets and histories more, and that no man taught me them. In place of which I had to read the devil's filth, the philosophers and sophists, at great cost, toil, and hurt, so that now I have enough to do to get rid of it." And then speaking of the ignorance prevalent in his day, he breaks forth as follows: "therefore we have received what was due, and God has right well repaid our unthankfulness, in not prizing his goodness, and providing while it was yet time, and while it was possible, for the securing of good books and learned persons, and in letting it slip as not concerning us. So, on his part, God, instead of the Bible and

\* Reckoned by us as the Fifth.



good books, suffered Aristotle and innumerable hurtful books to come in, which drew us further and further from the Bible. Besides this, were the devil-masks, friars, college-spectres, maintained at huge expense, with many doctors, preachers, masters, parsons, and monks, that is to say, great, gross, fat donkeys, decked with red and brown caps, like swine led by a chain of gold and pearls, and we have laden ourselves with these, who have taught us nothing good, but have made us more and more blind and sottish, and, in return, have devoured all our goods, and filled every cloister and every corner, with the ordure of their unsavoury, poisonous books; till to think thereon is horror!" These coarse but powerful passages will do more to show the zeal of Luther for religious education, than pages of dissertation could do.

It has already been said that the Reformation brought with it a revival of catechetical instruction, and mention has been made of the Catechisms of Luther. The origin and general character of these compositions belongs to our subject. They were preceded by some smaller works. The Reformation had scarcely dawned, before Luther perceived the importance of giving religious training to the young, after a regular form. As the result of popular discourses delivered in 1516 and 1517, the Reformer, printed, in 1518, an exposition of the Decalogue.\* Two years after he set forth a similar book in German; the Lord's Prayer and Creed being added. And in a preface to his book on the German church-service, he wrote, in 1526: "First of all, we stand in need, for God's service in German, of a *rugged, plain, simple, good Catechism*. Catechism means an instruction, whereby Heathen, who mean to be Christians, may be taught and directed, what they are to believe, do, and know, in Christianity."

When the visitation of the churches, alluded to above, was made in 1527 and the years following, Luther was so convinced of the wretched ignorance of the parish priests, that in the latter part of 1528, he prepared a Catechism. "Just now," writes he, "I am busy, making a catechism for the rude pagans."† It was his intention to confine himself to the first and larger work,

\* "Decem Præcepta predicata populo, per Mart. Luther." Vit. 1518. Opera, ed. Walch. tom. x. p. 182. s. 99.

† Letters, III. p. 417, 426.

but afterwards he thought it necessary to afford something more compendious. There has been some question as to the order of their appearance, but it is now well established that the larger one came first; and this is what might be judged from examining it, since it bears every mark of a first draught. Of our two Westminster Catechisms, on the other hand, it is well known, that the Shorter was first written. Both of Luther's were issued in 1529. Both were written by him in his peculiarly nervous German. They began to be extensively used, and good old Mathesius says more than a hundred thousand copies were circulating in the Latin and German schools: so that now they are always included among the Symbolical Books of the Lutheran Church. The two principal Latin versions were those of Lonicerus and Obsopoeus. The Larger Catechism fills about one hundred and thirty pages of large duodecimo. After a twofold preface, it is divided into six parts, under these heads; the Ten Commandments, the Apostles' Creed, the Lord's Prayer, Baptism, and the Sacrament of the Altar (as he continued to call the Lord's Supper.)

Luther's Larger Catechism is not in the form of question and answer, but is a familiar and somewhat diffuse admonition to preachers and teachers, as to the way in which they should explain and inculcate the subjects above mentioned. Some of his sound and pungent sayings will give an idea of his plainness. These instructors, he says, had grown so conceited, and so cloyed with the simplicity of divine truth, that after reading over the catechism once, they were ready to throw it into a corner, as if they knew all about it; "a noxious and pestiferous evil." "Whereas I," he adds, "if I may speak of myself, though Doctor and preacher, and not less learned or experienced than those who thus presume, and who have come to so great assurance, am nowise ashamed to do as the boys do. For, as we teach them the Catechism, so do I, in the morning, or at any other spare time, say over to myself, word for word, the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, the Ten Commandments, some Psalms, &c."\* "Wherefore," says he, "I do now once more entreat and conjure all Christians, but especially all pastors and preachers, not to seek to be Doctors before the time, nor falsely to persuade

themselves that they know every thing. But if they use diligence, I solemnly promise them, and they shall themselves experience the same, that they shall thence derive great fruit, and that God will make superior men of them, so that they shall one day themselves confess, that the more they repeat and reiterate the doctrine of the Catechism, the less they apprehend and know it, but have need to be ever learning it."

Luther gives some directions as to the way in which the work of catechizing shall be conducted. Let the reader judge whether we do not find in them the germ of that household tree, which has borne such goodly fruit in the land of our Presbyterian forefathers. "The duty of the faithful and watchful father demands, that *once a week in the least*, he should make trial by examination of his children and family, and discover what they understand or have learnt; solemnly constraining them, in case of ignorance, to learn these things thoroughly."

The treatise (for such it is) abounds in those striking and memorable sayings, which characterize all Luther's writings, but especially those which are in German. The racy idioms often remind us of our own Bunyan: they are as strong, as witty, and as coarse. Writing as Luther did, to draw souls away from the gins and traps of popery, he loses no opportunity of detecting the Romish snares. "This (catechetical) way of education," says he, "so drives the roots into the heart, that children fear God more than they dread ferule or whip. And the reason I speak so simply is for the youth's sake, that the roots may at length penetrate their inmost mind. For when we teach children, we must prattle in their own tongue."\* Speaking of the abuses of the Sabbath, he says: "Those indeed know full well how to keep holidays and festivals, who are very far from Christ and all piety; since we see all that hive, and idle luxurious throng of our religious orders, who stand daily in churches, chanting and trolling (*singen und klingen*) bawling and vociferating, and yet, with all their stentorian cry and lupine howling, keeping no Sabbath. For they neither teach nor practice any word of God, but express what is quite diverse and opposite, by both their doctrine and their life."

This larger Catechism of Luther well deserves our study. It

\* Cat. Maj. P. I. §. 64.

was evidently written from a full mind and heart, and with a rapid pen. Being the first deliberate attempt, in this kind, of the Reformation era, it is not to be expected that it should be either so exhaustive or so succinct, as later productions. This will be manifest from a comparison of what relates to the Law, with the masterly exposition of the Decalogue, in our own Catechisms. The division of the Romanists is retained; so that our fourth commandment is Luther's third, and so on, to the tenth, which is numbered ninth and tenth. The view taken of the Sabbath is lower than that of British and American Protestants, being much the same with that of Calvin. The sign of the cross, in prayer, is commanded. And, in regard to the sacraments, those remnants of popish opinion are of course apparent, in regard to which Luther differed so signally from Calvin, and especially from Zwingli. But the work, as a whole, is a good and great work, and must ever be venerable as the first monument of catechetical Protestantism.

The SHORTER CATECHISM of Luther is in the form of question and answer. It is very simple, and so short as not to take up more than twenty pages, duodecimo. The order is as follows: I. The Decalogue. II. The Apostles' Creed; under three articles, 1. Of Creation, 2. Of Redemption, 3. Of Sanctification. III. The Lord's Prayer. IV. The Sacrament of Baptism. V. The Sacrament of the Altar. There are three appendixes; 1. Morning and Evening Prayers; 2. Grace before and after Meat; 3. Economic Maxims.

A specimen of the doctrinal part will scarcely fail to be acceptable; it relates to the second portion of the Creed, viz.: "And in Jesus Christ his only Son, our Lord," etc.

"Q. What is the meaning of this article?

'A. I believe that Jesus Christ, very God, eternally begotten of the Father, and very man, born of the virgin Mary, is my Lord, who redeemed me a lost and condemned human being [*hominem*] and freed me from all sins, from death, and from the power of Satan, not with silver and gold, but with his own holy and precious blood, and with his innocent passion and death, that I should be wholly his, and should live under him in his kingdom, and should serve him in perpetual righteousness, in-



nocence, and blessedness, as he himself rose from the dead, and liveth and reigneth forever. This is most certainly true.”\*

The Economic Maxims, at the close, are under fourteen heads; of which all are simple texts of scripture, except the last. They relate to all relative duties. The closing one is a couplet, in three languages, Latin, German, and Greek:

“Cuique sit inprimis magnæ sua lectio curæ,  
Ut domus officiis stet decorata suis.”

“Ein jeder lern sein Lection,  
So wird es wol im Hause ston.”

“Let every one his lesson learn,  
For this to household-good shall turn.”

In the preface to this Shorter Catechism, Luther is very urgent upon a point, which is essential to catechetical instruction, but which is in danger of being entirely neglected, in this day of supposed progress in education; namely, the importance of committing a set form to the memory.

“I therefore,” says he, “beseech and conjure all you, who are pastors and preachers, that you solemnly discharge your duty, and take care of the people committed to you by God. And this you will best do, by joining us in inculcating this catechism every where, and especially on the young. But if any of you are so unlearned, as to have no knowledge whatever of these things, let not such be ashamed, to read to their hearers this prescribed form, word for word, in this manner. First of all, let preachers beware how they set forth the decalogue, or the Lord’s Prayer, or the Creed, or the Sacraments, sometimes in one way, and sometimes in another; but let them constantly use the same form, in the common propounding and explaining these things. And my reason for giving this advice is that I know that the simpler people and youth cannot be successfully taught, *except by one and the same form often proposed and repeated*. For if you present the same things, sometimes in one way and sometimes in another, the more simple minds are apt to be confused, and the result is, that all your pains in teaching goes for nothing.” “It is another affair, when you teach the gospel in an assembly of learned men; then you may give a specimen of your erudition; and I do not forbid your varying your mode of discussion, offering sometimes one and sometimes another as-

\* Ed. Franke, p. 73.

pect in speaking. But with the more simple, always use the same form, set forth in certain words." "As I have said above, that the simple catechism is to be always taught in the same words, so I would desire, also, that in the explanation of the catechism, the same mode of treatment should be pursued, without altering a single syllable."

The principle contained in these directions is of great moment in all juvenile instruction. It is too commonly thought, that the point is gained with children, when they are known to *understand the matter for the time being*: and this fallacy is encouraged by the slovenly popular methods of abundant questions, to be answered in the pupil's own words. On the contrary, as the basis of every science, as a subject of teaching, is laid in concise and exact definitions; and as the language of these definitions cannot be altered without some loss; so the only safe method of beginning is to charge the memory of the learner with the very words of such definitions. This is equally true of syntax, geometry, physics, metaphysics, and theology. Those more diffuse and tentative methods which are good in the closet are out of place in the school; and the way of discovering truth is not always the way of inculcating it. All first-lines of instruction must proceed upon authority; the truth must be given as *dogma*. In a word, though we arrive at principles *analytically*, we teach them *synthetically*. Hence it is not a traditional but a most philosophic method, to demand the accurate learning by rote of catechetical forms. It is invariably found, that the best theologians are not those who have enjoyed the fullest cursory reading even of the best authors, but those who have enriched their memory with the most complete body of exact definitions.

In the churches of the Reformed, there was no less attention paid to the training of the young. Among their monuments, none is more venerable than the Catechism by John Calvin, commonly called the Geneva Catechism. This was set forth in French, in 1536, and in Latin, in 1538.\* The Geneva edition of 1545 was revised by the author. It was followed by forms of prayer, both for private use, and for the church service: these may be seen appended to most old editions of the

\* Augusti, Liber. Symb. Ecc. Ref. p. 647.

French New Testament. This Catechism obtained extraordinary diffusion, being publicly used in Switzerland, Holland, and to some extent for a time in Scotland and England.\* Such was its value in France, that it was expounded in all the Reformed churches of that country, on Sunday afternoons, until the revocation of the Edict; and this by decrees of the great National Synods.† It was translated into almost all the modern languages of Europe, besides being put into Greek by Henry Stephanus, and into Hebrew by Tremellius.

The judgment of Calvin concerning the value of juvenile instruction, may be learnt from his famous letter to Somerset, and from his preface to the Catechism itself. "Let there besides," he writes to the Lord Protector of England, "be published a plain formula or catechism, for the use of children, and those who may be more ignorant among the people. Thus the truth will be rendered more familiar to them, and at the same time they will learn to distinguish it from impostures and corruptions, which are so apt to creep in by little and little upon the ignorant and careless. *It becomes you to be persuaded, that the church of God cannot be without a catechism;* for therein the true seed of doctrine is to be contained, from which at length the pure and seasonable harvest will be matured, and from this the seed may be multiplied abundantly. Wherefore, if you expect to build an edifice of this kind, which shall last long, and be safe from destruction, give all care that each child be instructed in the faith, by the catechism published for that purpose; that they may learn briefly, and as their capacities will admit, in what consists true Christianity. The usefulness of the catechism will not be confined merely to the instruction of children. The consequence will also be, that the people, being taught by it, will be better prepared to profit by the ordinary preaching of the word; and also if any one, puffed up, should introduce any new opinions, he may be detected by an immediate appeal to the rule of the Catechism."

In the Preface, Calvin uses language which may well seem prophetic to those who in this year of 1848, a little more than three centuries after the date of the Geneva Catechism, observe

\* L'Enfant, Discours sur les Catechismes, p. 101, s. 99.

† Buddeus, Isagoge, p. 341.

the National Synod of the French Protestants repudiating the faith of their forefathers, and thus verifying the prediction of the Reformer.

“But if this is so needful now, what shall we say of posterity? On this subject I am so anxious, that I scarcely dare to think. *And O that our sons may not some day regard this rather as a vaticination, than a conjecture!* Whence we must give the more pains, to bind up in our writings, such remains of the church, as may survive us, or perhaps emerge into notice. Other sorts of writings may show, indeed, what the religious opinions of us all were; but the doctrinal agreement of our churches cannot be evinced by a more illustrious testimony, than that of Catechisms. For there will it appear, not merely what this or that man has taught, but what rudiments have been inculcated among us from boyhood, on all, whether learned or unlearned; all believers having this for a solemn symbol of Christian Communion. This indeed was my principal reason for setting forth this Catechism.”

A little after he adds in a characteristic passage: “Moreover I think it is becoming as an example, that it be testified to the world, that we, who endeavour the edification of the Church, should every where address ourselves faithfully to this, that the use of Catechizing, which some ages ago was abolished under the papacy, should now as it were be restored to its rights. For we can neither commend this holy institution according to its merits, nor sufficiently rebuke the flagitious popish corruptions, which by turning it into childish fooleries, not only did it away, but basely perverted it to a cloak for their own foul and impious superstition. For they observe no bounds, in adorning that adulterous Confirmation, which they have made to usurp its place, with a great meretricious splendour of ceremonies, and many deckings of pomp: but while they seek to adorn, they really bedeck it with execrable blasphemies, while they vaunt it as a sacrament worthier than Baptism, giving the name of *semi-Christians* to all who have been anointed with their unsavory oil: meanwhile their whole action comprises nothing but histrionic gesticulations, or rather the wanton tricks of monkeys.”\*

\* Augusti, p. 462.



The Address to the reader is in these words. "It was always an observance of the Church, and diligently provided for, that children should be duly trained in Christian doctrine. That this might be done more conveniently, not only were schools opened, of old time, and individuals ordered to instruct their respective families aright, but it was also matter of public injunction and practice, for children to be examined in churches, on each of the articles, which ought to be common and known among all Christians. That this might be orderly done, a formula was draughted, which was called the *Catechism*, or instruction. After that time, the devil, miserably lacerating the church of God, and bringing in horrid destruction, (the marks of which are even now too visible in most of the earth) overthrew this holy arrangement; nor did he leave anything in its place, but sundry trifles, engendering superstitions only, with no fruit of edification. Such is what they call *Confirmation*, fraught indeed with postures worse than laughable, quite befitting apes, and resting on no foundation. What therefore we here offer, is nothing else than the practice of those things, which from antiquity were observed by Christians and true worshippers of God, and which were never omitted, but while the Church was utterly corrupt."\*

The starting point of the Geneva Catechism is the same as that of the Westminster, viz: "*What is the chief end of man's life?*" It proceeds then to develope the highest good of man—the knowledge and worship of God—in Jesus Christ—as set forth in the Apostles' Creed, which is then expounded. After this follow the Decalogue, and the Lord's Prayer. Then are treated the Scriptures, and the Sacraments. The plan of the work differs materially from the Catechisms with which we are familiar, and we cannot but think that the comparison is in favour of our own. The question is supposed to be asked by the teacher, and is in some instances longer than the answer; the question is not rehearsed in the answer; and the series of answers do not form a body of connected propositions. For example: "*M. How then say you that we are justified by faith?* *P.* Because, when with certain confidence of

\* Augusti, p. 464.

heart, we embrace the promises of the gospel, we do, in a manner, obtain possession of this righteousness, of which I speak.

*M. This is your meaning then, that the righteousness, as it is offered to us by God through the gospel, so it is received of us by faith? P. So it is."*

The exposition of the fourth commandment will serve more fully as a specimen, and will also show Calvin's doctrine of the Sabbath. "*M. Does he command to labour six days, that we may rest the seventh? P. Not simply: but giving six days to men's labours, he reserves the seventh, on which it is not permitted to labour.*

*M. Does he forbid all labour on one day of the week? P. This commandment has a peculiar consideration. For the observance of rest is part of the ceremonies of the old law. And for this cause it was abolished at the coming of Christ.*

*M. Say you that this commandment pertains properly to the Jews, and was given for the time of the Old Testament? P. Yes; so far as it is ceremonial.*

*M. Why? Is there anything in it besides ceremony? P. It was given for three reasons. M. What are they? P. To figure spiritual rest; for ecclesiastical polity; and for the relief of servants.*

*M. What is spiritual rest? P. It is to cease from our own works, that the Lord may work in us.*

*M. How is this accomplished? P. By mortifying our flesh, that is, renouncing our nature, in order that God may govern us by his Spirit. M. Should this be done only on one day of the week? P. It ought to be done continually; for when we have once begun, we must continue all our life.*

*M. Why then is there a certain day assigned to figure this? P. It is not required that the figure be in everything like the reality; it is enough that it have some resemblance.*

*M. Why is the seventh day ordained, rather than any other? P. The number seven, in scripture, denotes perfection. It is therefore proper to denote perpetuity. Thus it admonishes us that our spiritual rest is only begun in this present life, and will not be perfected until we depart from this world.*

*M. But what is the meaning of the reason here alleged by our Lord, that we must rest, as he has done? P. After having created all his works in six days, he dedicated the seventh to*

the consideration of these. And to lead us the better to do this, he alleges his own example. For there is nothing so desirable, as to be conformed to him.

*M. Must we always meditate on the works of God ; or is it enough to do so one day in the week ?* *P.* It should be done every day ; but by reason of our infirmity, one day has been specially appointed. And this is the polity of which I spake.

*M. What order then should be observed on this day ?* *P.* People should assemble, to be instructed in the truth of God, to offer common prayers, and to render testimony to the faith and religion.

*M. How do you understand this precept to be given for the relief of servants ?* *P.* To give some relaxation to those who are under the power of others. And this equally subserves the common polity ; for each one accustoms himself to labour the rest of the time, seeing he has a day of rest.

*M. Now tell us how this commandment addresses itself to us ?* *P.* Touching the ceremony, it is abolished. For we have the accomplishment in Jesus Christ.

*M. How ?* *P.* Because our old man is crucified by the virtue of his death ; and because by his resurrection we rise to newness of life.

*M. What remains of it then to us ?* *P.* That we observe the order instituted in the church, for hearing the word of the Lord, joining in public prayers and sacraments, and that we do not contravene the spiritual polity which exists among believers.

*M. And is the figure of no more use to us ?* *P.* Nay, indeed : for we must return to its reality ; which is, that being true members of Christ, we cease from our own works that we may resign ourselves to his government."

In this extract we have followed the French, which differs considerably in point of expression from the conciser Latin. When we consider the time at which this catechism was made, and the generality of its reception, by means of which hundreds of thousands in many countries received from it the lessons of salvation ; and its exposition in all the French and Walloon churches, according to its division among the Sundays of the year ; we may justly rank this among the most impor-

tant works of the great Reformer, while we place it by the side of the analogous production of Martin Luther.

The example of Luther and Calvin was followed by many in both divisions of the Protestant body. On the Lutheran side, some proceeded to frame other catechisms, intended to amplify what was in the original, or to supply its defects; others expended labour in commenting more or less largely on the text. Among the former must be numbered Philip Melancthon, John Brentius, John Mathesius (so well known as the affectionate biographer of Luther), Nicholas Selnecker, David Chytraeus, John Wigand, and Nicholas Hemming. Indeed almost every state in Germany had its respective manual in which the catechism of Luther was enlarged and explained. The Gotha catechism, for example, was by Solomon Glassius: the Dantzic catechism, is noted by Abraham Calovius, and those of Dresden, Frankfort, and Quedlinburg, by Spener, who added to his other labours for Christ, a plain exposition of the Smaller Catechism; a work which Buddeus says is marked by his characteristic judgment. It is called by Mayer "an incomparable work," on account of its fulness and clearness, the solidity of the scripture proofs, and the tendency of the whole to promote vital piety in the learner; nothing less was to have been expected from one whom God employed as a chosen vessel for the revival of religion in a cold time. Wittenberg, Tübingen, and Leipsick had their several catechisms.\*

Other works of catechetical form far transcended the ability of youth, and even rose to the level of theological systems. Such was that of Dietericus, entitled "Catechetical Institutes," often enlarged upon, in the way of lectures and annotations, by such men as Chemnitius and Bechmann. A similar book by Danhauer, entitled '*Catechetical Milk*,' has been thought to contain not only milk for babes, but strong meat for men. There were many who published sermons founded on the order of this little book of the Reformer. So that we may bless God that Luther was ever led to such a composition.

On the side of the Reformed, much was also done; as may be read in L'Enfant's work on Catechisms. All these were however eclipsed by one, which acquired an authority, still

\* Buddeus, u. s. p. 335.



existing in our own day; this was the *Heidelberg Catechism*.

A little explanation will here be necessary. Among those countries in which the Calvinistic doctrines found great favour one of the most noted was the Palatinate. Under Frederick II., surnamed the Wise, and Otto Henry, the Magnanimous, that is, from 1544 to 1559, the Palatinate was Lutheran. But Frederick III., about the year 1560, introduced the Swiss reform, both in doctrine and worship. He was a pious and distinguished man.\* He thought it of great importance to fix the opinions which he maintained, by comprehending them in a catechetical formula. For the preparation of this, he employed two eminent theologians, Zachary Ursinus, and Caspar Olevianus; who were aided, some say, by Boquin and Tremellius. Ursinus, of Breslau, who is to be carefully distinguished from a Lutheran divine of the same name, was a pupil of Melancthon, and was professor first at Heidelberg and then at Neustadt; he died in 1583. Olevianus became professor at Heidelberg in 1584, and was afterwards at Herborn; he wrote an Exposition of the Apostles Creed, and died in 1587. The labour of compiling the new work fell chiefly on Ursinus. When complete it was subjected to the clergy of the Palatinate, in 1562, and in 1563 was published with the sanction of the Elector Palatine. It is a singular fact, that his successor, Louis VI., who lived during the days of the celebrated 'Formula of Concord,' reverted to Lutheranism, and altered both creed and church-service, after the Lutheran pattern. After his death, in 1583, Calvinism was restored.† Guericke, the representative of old school Lutheranism, commends this work, for its warmth and ability, and its general richness of doctrine, but adds, that on the Lord's Supper, it contains the Calvinistic and in part even the Zwinglian doctrine, in most decisive expressions, and that it utters the Calvinistic dogma of Predestination only in an obscure manner.‡ The Heidelberg or Palatine Catechism, for it was known by both names, received respectful attention from many Lutherans, for its method, comprehensiveness, and general truth; but among the Reformed it quickly rose to the authority of a public symbol. Next to the second Helvetic Confession, it is supposed to have

\* Hase, Kgschte. § 362. † Hase, Kgschte. § 362. ‡ Guericke, Kgschte, ed. 6. vol. iii. p. 553.

been the most valued and widely extended formula. It had currency not only in Germany, but in Hungary, Switzerland, and especially in Holland, from which it came with the Dutch emigration to America. Among the numerous men of learning who have written commentaries upon it, may be mentioned Ursinus himself, Pareus, Mylius, Cocceius, Momma, Alting, Leydecker, Hulsius, Becker, and Reuter. It was vehemently assaulted by Angelo de Monte Bello, of Louvain, and was defended against him by Henry Alting, of Groeningen, who also defended it against the Arminian objections of the Remonstrants.

The undeniable excellencies of the Heidelberg Catechism ensured it a final triumph, and in the seventeenth session of the Synod of Dort, it was approved by that body, and comprehended among the symbolical books of the Reformed Dutch Church. This was further confirmed in the Convention at the Hague, in 1651.\* Among the Rules of Church Government, established in the Synod of Dort, the sixty-eighth is as follows: "Every minister shall, in the afternoon service on the Lord's day, briefly *explain* the system of the Christian doctrine comprehended in the *Catechism*, adopted by the Reformed Churches; so that, if practicable, the explanation may be annually completed, according to the sections made for that purpose in said catechism."† It is to be observed, that the Catechism is divided into portions for fifty-two Lord's days. While this rule was faithfully observed, it tended to produce that uniformity of orthodox belief which has been the glory of the Dutch churches; and it is much to be deplored, that in our large cities, this venerable usage has fallen somewhat into desuetude. Such importance was ascribed to catechetical instruction by the Reformed Churches, that it is expressly decreed by the last Synod of Dort, in its seventeenth session, that there should be observed a threefold method of catechizing: viz.

"1st, Domestic, by Parents.

"2d, Scholastic, by Schoolmasters.

"3d, Ecclesiastic, by Pastors, Elders, Readers, or Visitors of the sick.

"And that all whose duty it is to visit and inspect the

\* Buddeus, *Isag.* p. 339, s. 99. † Const. Ref. Dutch Ch. ed. N. Y. 1815. p. 192.

churches and schools, shall be admonished to make this the first object of their care."

To carry this plan into effect, so far as respects the second method of instruction, there was made another decree, which comprises the following resolutions:

"1st. Schools for the education of children and youth shall be established wherever they may be found necessary.

2d. Provision shall be made for procuring and maintaining suitable teachers.

3d. The children of the poor must be provided for in these schools, or in others, expressly for them.

4th. No person shall be appointed to the charge of these schools, who is not a member of the Reformed church, furnished with testimonials of his orthodoxy and good morals, and who shall not previously have subscribed the Confession of Faith, the Belgic Catechism, and solemnly promised to instruct the children committed to his care, in the principles contained in the church standards.

5th. They shall, according to the age and capacity of the children, employ two half-days in every week, not only in hearing them repeat, but assisting them to understand their catechism; shall examine them frequently, inculcate upon them the necessity of regular attendance upon the ordinances of religion, accompany them to the ordinances, and promote their benefit from them.

6th. To promote fidelity in the teachers, and progress in the children, it shall be the duty of the pastors and elders, frequently to visit these schools, to direct and encourage the teachers in the method of catechising; to examine the children with mild severity, and to excite them to industry, by holy exhortations, by commendations, and with suitable rewards."\*

It is our purpose, at some more convenient time, to revert to this subject of Catechetical History; and we shall probably then find occasion to discuss at greater length the origin and character of the great **HEIDELBERG CATECHISM**.

\* Report to General Synod of R. D. C., 1809.

ART. IV.—*The Free Church Pulpit*, consisting of Discourses by the most eminent Divines of the Free Church of Scotland in three volumes. Robert Carter, 58 Canal Street. 1848.

THE power of true religion in influencing the minds of men has seldom, if ever, been more manifest than in that great multitude of people who relinquish all the comforts and advantages of the established church of Scotland, rather than submit to an authority attempted to be exercised by the civil government over the spiritual concerns of the church. This sacrifice, it is true, was principally made by the pastors of the churches, who were living in comfortable manses, and whose support was received from the funds of the established church; but in regard to the people, they subjected themselves to the burden of sustaining their ministers, and providing houses of worship, and manses for the comfortable accommodation of their pastors. Indeed, though the sacrifice at first was heaviest on the ministers and schoolmasters; yet eventually, the burden fell almost entirely on the people; for by their liberality, ministers and schoolmasters were made as comfortable as before the disruption. We are at a loss, whether most to admire the zeal and resolution which influenced such a multitude to relinquish their connection with the established church or their unanimity and liberality and energy, in carrying through their various *schemes* for the support and enlargement of the Free Church. During the last half century, there must have been a great revival of vital godliness in this portion of the Scottish church. This growth was gradual and silent, but real and extensive. There was, during this period, a return to the good old ways, which for a while had been partially forsaken by the most. Considering the evidence of the power of religion exhibited by the ministers, elders, and members of the Free Church, in this extraordinary event, we naturally feel a curiosity to know what was the character of the sermons preached by those pastors who took the lead in this remarkable exodus. With some of the leaders in this transaction, the Christian public had had the opportunity of knowing something; but in regard to much the greater number, we, in this country, enjoyed no opportunity of any acquaintance with them. It was, therefore, a matter of



real gratification to the American churches, when the Free Church thought proper to send a deputation of some of their best preachers, to solicit aid in accomplishing the great work which they had undertaken. And the impression made by the sermons delivered in our churches, by these distinguished men, was altogether favourable. The impression, indeed, was made on some minds, that, from these specimens, the preaching of the Scottish ministers, at least of the Free Church of Scotland, was superior to that of the preachers of any denomination, in this country. As a class, perhaps it may be true, that the pulpit of the Free Church is superior to that of any other body of Christians in the world. But we cannot form a correct general conclusion, on this point, from the sermons of a few persons. The deputies to this country from the Free Church of Scotland, were selected from their most distinguished men. And again, these men preached, no doubt, their very best sermons. A false inference is often drawn from a single sermon, prepared with great care, and delivered in favourable circumstances, of the usual discourses of the man. The sermons of no preacher are uniformly great; nor is the same sermon, preached on different occasions, equally popular and impressive. And some discourses which were almost universally admired, as delivered from the pulpit, when published are found to possess no extraordinary merit.

After hearing the brethren from Scotland, there arose, naturally, a curiosity to know how far their discourses might be considered a fair specimen of the Free Scottish pulpit. Beyond expectation, the opportunity is now afforded of fully gratifying this curiosity. In the volumes now under review, we have sermons from more than a hundred of those ministers who went out of the established church and formed the Free Church of Scotland. We have also a number of sermons, by ministers who have since joined the Free Church, or have been ordained by its presbyteries; whose sermons, in our judgment, are not inferior to those of their older brethren. The whole number of discourses is one hundred and sixty. In examining these discourses, we have been gratified to find, that almost universally they are truly evangelical and practical, and so perspicuous in style, that they are well adapted to the common reader.

Our next remark is, that in very few of them is there any

display of extraordinary talent, or marked originality. They appear to us to be generally free from that ambition of fine writing, into which some preachers in this country are apt to fall. These sermons appear to have been composed, not for publication, originally, but for the instruction and edification of common Christians. In general, they are more particularly addressed to the pious, than to the impenitent; and, in our judgment, they will be perused with pleasure and profit by serious people. It is difficult, however, to give a general character of compositions from the pens of considerably more than a hundred preachers; except as to their spiritual and evangelical character. Every preacher has something peculiar to himself, by which he is distinguished from all others. We must say, however, that few of these sermons, if brought to the test of the rules of criticism, would be judged to be complete. There is commonly a manifest defect in the exordium or introduction. In some of the sermons, there is nothing of the kind, but an abrupt commencement of the discussion of the subject. And where there is an exordium, it seems generally to have been composed with little care. We are aware, that there is an error on the other extreme. The introduction to some sermons is too elaborate, too figurative, too pathetic, or too splendid. Though it may excite admiration, yet it injures the effect of the more solid parts of the discourse. The expectation of the hearers is raised too high; and when these expectations are not realized in the sequel of the discourse, dissatisfaction if not disgust is apt to be produced. Such exordiums have been well compared to a very splendid vestibule to a plain building. As an example of such introductions, we would mention Saurin's sermons. Sometimes, indeed, this elegant preacher keeps up and continues the elevated feelings, excited by his exordium, through the whole discourse. But often this is not the case: and after a splendid proem, you have a dry doctrinal discussion; or if not dry, yet matter addressed entirely to the understanding. One of the very best preachers we ever had the opportunity of hearing, frequently had this fault; his exordium was always composed with care, and every word of it written; while, for the remainder of his sermon, he had only brief notes of the heads and principal ideas. A very deserving minister of another denomination, after hearing him several times, said, that when he listened to

his highly wrought and rhetorical introductions, he was charmed beyond expression; but when he came to the doctrinal discussions arising out of the text, there was a sensible falling off; and though well pleased in the main, the expectations excited in the beginning were painfully disappointed.

There may be occasions, indeed, in which no introduction is needed; and others, in which it may be proper to have an elaborate exordium, arising from the peculiar circumstances, or prejudices of the audience. But it should be remembered, that the main design of an exordium should be, to prepare the hearers for the body of the discourse. It should be simple and remarkably perspicuous, and at the same time interesting in a gentle degree; so that the sluggish minds of the hearers, should not, at the first, be taxed with an effort to understand what is said; and it should not be mere common-place, expressed in common phrases; but while what is said should command assent as soon as proposed, and should be sufficiently interesting to the feelings to command attention, it should not be adapted to make a strong impression, or to call forth lively admiration.

Another thing essential in a good exordium is, that while it avoids the anticipation of the matters to be discussed in the main subject of the discourse, it should have such a relation to it as to prepare the minds of the audience for the favourable reception of the main argument. Often the best introduction may be derived from the context; and at other times from some related truth not intended to be discussed. And where it is known, that strong prejudices are entertained by the hearers, it will be best not to attack them at once, but to obviate them indirectly, by a series of remarks which may serve as a foundation for their subversion. It is sometimes the case, that a preacher, when he appears before an audience, has suggested to him, by the very appearance of things, what is the suitable matter with which to make his first address to them. And though he may intend to read his sermon, this need not prevent him from availing himself of such suggestions as may be pertinent and seasonable. Every speaker must know, that much depends upon getting the thoughts and feelings of the audience at the commencement, in unison with his own and with the subject. When the confidence of the hearers is conciliated they can be led along with much ease. This however shows, that

not only is it important to have a good introduction, but that the preacher's mind be in a right state. Without right feelings in the speaker, it is vain to expect them in the audience.

The old Scotch method of sermonizing was, to make formal divisions, and then to abound in subdivisions; and to conclude with numerous uses, inferences, or practical reflexions. The sermons of the two Erskines may be taken as an excellent model of this method of distributing the several parts of a discourse. They were also fond of preaching many sermons from a single text; so that sometimes they would contrive to include a whole body of divinity in a series of discourses on one text. The excellent Mr. Derham, we recollect, has a whole volume of discourses on a single chapter. But the present race of Scotch preachers have entirely departed from the old method: they have, perhaps, verged too closely on the opposite extreme. Until we examined these volumes of sermons, by ministers of the Free Church, we had supposed, that the old method of formal divisions and subdivisions was retained by plain evangelical preachers in the country. But here we have sermons from more than a hundred preachers of that church; and scarcely one of them is cast in the ancient mould. Perhaps, in one fourth of the whole, the subject is distributed into heads, and these announced at the beginning; but in these the divisions are few, never exceeding four general heads, and commonly confined to two. But in the majority of these sermons, there is no formal division announced; after a brief exordium, the preacher draws from the text some prominent truth, on which he makes his remarks, and then proceeds to another point; and thus, through the whole discourse. And in some of the sermons there are no divisions of any kind marked, but the whole is a continued discourse on some one point, from the beginning to the end. An inquiry naturally arises here, which of these methods of sermonizing is best? The proper answer is, that each has its advantages and disadvantages. The same method is not suited to every subject, nor to every age. Formerly, when books were scarce, it was considered very important that the method of sermonizing should be such as to favour the memory. It was very customary for pious people to meet, after hearing a sermon, and repeat the discourse to one another: and from Mr. Baxter we learn, that ministers were accustomed to re-



peat their own sermons at private meetings, after delivering them in public. It was also a custom, not yet entirely obsolete, for parents to require their children and domestics, to give on the Sabbath evenings, an account of the sermon which they had heard during the day. It is evident, that the old method of arranging the subjects under general heads, and subdivisions greatly facilitated the memorizing of them; and if that were an object of importance now, the old method should be retained, or rather restored. But now, when good sermons in print so much abound, it seems scarcely necessary to tax the memory with the retention of all the sermons which are heard. So far as this custom serves to fix the attention of the hearers, which might otherwise wander, it is good; but experience teaches, that the intense exercise of memory tends to prevent the proper exercise of the feelings and emotions, which the truth ought to produce; and the main object of preaching is to excite the affections and lead to the resolutions, which correspond with the nature of evangelical truth. The philosophy of this fact of experience is plain enough; but we need not at present enter into it. The same is true in regard to taking notes of sermons which we hear, or writing them down in short hand; the attention required in catching the words of the speaker prevents all proper feeling at the moment. But if we do not get the right impression of the truth while hearing a sermon, we are not likely to receive it from the perusal of notes of the discourse afterwards. In our opinion, therefore, the best method of hearing any discourse is to hear the word completely unoccupied with extraneous circumstances, and entirely free and open to receive the impression which the truths delivered are calculated to make.

Often, when a preacher announces to his hearers certain heads, on each of which he intends to treat, they are prone to run before him and try to anticipate what he will say under each. And if he dwells long on one, they become uneasy lest the sermon should be unreasonably and inconveniently long. And sometimes, when the heads of a discourse are heard, the intelligent hearer is in possession of the whole; for the discussion turns out to be a mere expansion of the idea contained in the original proposition. This is the circumstance that renders some sermons, which are carefully composed and judiciously arranged as to method, uninteresting. The preacher

makes no allowance for the hearer's ability to think and infer; but explains too much, and spends time in explaining what is already perfectly understood.

Robert Hall, in an ordination sermon, has some very judicious remarks on the subject of announcing formally what the preacher intends to accomplish. Speakers in the senate and at the bar seldom pursue this method. Yet this method, though not usually necessary, is sometimes very proper; as when two or more distinct propositions are intended to be discussed, it is convenient to have this distinctly understood at the beginning. And sometimes, when a text furnishes several distinct heads, the preacher may find it expedient not to handle every one, but it may suit his purpose to take up only a part, or perhaps only one point, and direct his whole attention to that; in which case, it is proper to exhibit in a general division, all the truths contained in the text; and then to inform his audience, that it is not his intention to dwell upon the whole, but only a part.

When divisions are formally made, it is important that they should be few in number; should be evidently contained in the text; and should not interfere with one another. Truths taken for granted or implied in a text, should be taken for granted by the preacher; or briefly exhibited by way of introduction. If the preacher wishes to dwell on such points, let him select an appropriate text, in which these matters are evidently introduced. Writers on rhetoric have insisted much on the importance of *unity* in public discourses; one rule of division, therefore is, not to make such a distribution of a subject as to require the discussion of things entirely diverse. This is a principle of common sense. When men speak they should aim at some definite object, to make some particular impression, or to persuade to some particular course of conduct. But the observance of this rule ought not to prevent the preacher from introducing any truths which he may judge useful and necessary to his people. Indeed the rule is less applicable to didactic discourses than is commonly supposed. Here the object is to communicate instruction, and though too much ought not to be attempted at once, yet, surely, no teacher ought to confine himself to a single point, when his hearers may stand in absolute need of knowing many other matters. He must not keep back truths which they must know or perish, or he will be responsible for the loss of

their souls. The great rule of the gospel preacher is, to bring forth to the people, whenever he addresses them, all the truths which he thinks will be most conducive to their edification and salvation; and if this ever comes in collision with the artificial rules of the teachers of eloquence, he must disregard them, as Paul did.

Enough has been said on the subject of method in sermonizing; it is more important to remark, that while the sermons, under consideration are not composed in accordance with the old model, as to method and formal divisions, they do conform in spirit and substance to the sermons of the best Scottish preachers, in the best time of the history of the Church of Scotland. These sermons possess very different degrees of merit; but it may be said of them, in general, that while they are strictly orthodox in doctrine, according to the Westminster Confession, they are spiritual and practical, and recognise constantly, the reality and necessity of the work of grace on the heart; and many of them describe accurately the exercises of the renewed heart, and exhibit clearly the privileges and consolations which are the heritage of true believers. We have been much gratified to observe that the views of these preachers, both as it relates to the doctrines of the gospel, and the interior life of the genuine Christian, his aspirations, imperfections, conflicts, temptations, and prevailing desires and purposes, do, in all respects, agree with the opinions and sentiments of the Presbyterian Church in America. The aim of the writers appears, evidently, to have been, to do good. There is no display—no straining after originality—no highly wrought pictures of the imagination—no undue refinement adapted to a fastidious taste—no affectation of classical learning—no strokes of satirical wit, and little or no controversy. You would scarcely know from these discourses, that any theological errors existed; or, that the whole world were not of the same mind in religion. There is not any where, that we have observed, any allusion to the “new divinity,” which has found its way into some sections of the Scottish Church; but we may infer from these sermons, that these new notions have not, to any considerable degree, agitated the great body of the Free Church congregations; or among so many sermons, there would have been some allusion to the fact.

We know that these new opinions, imported from America, have occasioned considerable excitement and agitation in what was until lately the United Secession Church. And we have read an account of a formal trial of a distinguished professor of theology, for holding or favouring the "new divinity." The only discourses in the number which manifest any thing of a controversial spirit, are one or two, which are directed against the Roman hierarchy.

As these sermons appear not to have been composed with a view to publication, but were originally intended for the edification of plain Christians, they contain scarcely any abstruse discussion on the different points of the Calvinistic system; but these doctrines are every where assumed as true, and a practical use made of them.

One thing rather surprised us, namely, that among so many discourses, so few are adapted to the conviction of impenitent sinners. And there is less notice taken of mere formalists and false professors than might have been expected, in so great a number of discourses. That must be a happy state of the church in which there is no occasion to warn the people against infidelity and error. It is admitted by all teachers of homiletics, that the conclusion of a sermon is commonly its most important part, as it is intended to fix on the mind and the heart the convictions and impressions which the discourse is intended to produce. Too often, however, even when the body of the discourse is well arranged and carefully composed, the peroration is left to take care of itself. The consequence is, that the preacher who pursues this course, is apt to fall into a tiresome repetition of what has before been said; or he sallies forth in a strain of exhortation, which often has no coherence with the preceding discourse, and is apt to degenerate into mere rant. The preacher, dissatisfied perhaps that he has succeeded so poorly in gaining the attention of his hearers, or making any sensible impression on their feelings, in the body of his sermon, makes, at the close, a great effort, by vociferation and violence of gesticulation to accomplish his purpose; and though some weak minds may be affected by such means, the more intelligent and judicious will go away dissatisfied, and often disgusted. If indeed a preacher happen to be in a good state of feeling, at the close of the doctrinal discussion, he may make a



more effective peroration, than he could have composed in his study; but as such a frame of mind cannot be safely calculated on, it is best to compose the *improvement* or practical application of his discourse with care; and if he at the moment should be enabled to bring forth something more suitable, and more impressive, very well. Whether a conclusion by instructive inferences, or by pungent and direct exhortation, be most edifying, will depend on a variety of circumstances. In a regular series of sermons to the same audience, the former is commonly most for edification; but on particular occasions, or when the people are somewhat excited, the latter is best. The judicious preacher will not confine himself to any one method of commencing or closing his sermons; but will be guided by the subject, and the circumstances of the people. In drawing out inferences, some judgment is required. Some preachers have nothing in their application, but what was clearly taught in the sermon: but inferences while they naturally flow from the subject discussed, must not contain the same ideas. Some eminent preachers have made their statement of doctrine brief, and have made up the larger part of their discourses, by instructive inferences.

We have been much disappointed in finding so little pains and labour, in the application of the sermons under review. What is said is commonly very good and very appropriate, but commonly it is very brief; sometimes only a few sentences. We cannot but think that this is a greater defect than the want of an exordium. Many of these discourses are sound, spiritual, and evangelical; but they are defective in the conclusion; and yet the subjects treated commonly furnish abundant matter for instructive or impressive applications.

Thirty-four of these discourses are, in the Scottish style, called *lectures*; by which they mean expository discourses, on a considerable portion of scripture. This is an excellent method of preaching, and possesses many advantages over the method of preaching from an isolated text; as it naturally brings up a great variety of subjects, which could scarcely be introduced into a regular sermon. And it brings the people to a better acquaintance with the Holy Scriptures, than the common method of preaching. The Scotch ministers ought to excel in this species of instruction; for we believe that it is a rule, at least a

custom, that of the two discourses delivered on the Sabbath, the one should be expository. We do not know why these discourses are termed *lectures*: in England and New England, any sermon preached out of the common routine is called a *lecture*; the Scotch meaning of the term is, however, well understood in our churches.

It was our purpose to have given an analysis of some of the ablest sermons in this collection; but it would seem invidious to select a few, where there are so many of real excellence. And it is unnecessary, since Mr. Carter, our enterprising religious bookseller, has published a handsome edition of these volumes, where they can be had at a moderate price. Instead, therefore, of furnishing our readers with the analysis at first intended, or with specimens of the sermons, we would recommend to them to obtain the work: it will be a rich treasure for any family. While the fondness for variety will be abundantly gratified by the different style and manner of discussing religious subjects, confidence may be felt, that in all of the sermons in the collection evangelical truth will be found, with such a practical tendency, as cannot but be both pleasing and edifying to the pious mind. We do therefore cordially recommend the whole work, as furnishing a rich addition to our stock of printed sermons.

But as some of our readers may wish to know the names of some of the authors, we will subjoin a list of the names of a few who are best known in this country, with the general subject of their discourses. The first sermon is from the pen of the Rev. James Sieveright, lately a moderator of the General Assembly. His subject is, "The Freedom of Gospel Worship from Social Circumstances and National Peculiarities, asserted." (Text, John iv. 24.)

The second sermon is from the Rev. Dr. James Brewster—"The Consolations and Sufferings of the Believer, and their effects on his Character." (1 Pet. v. 10.)

"Moses a Type of Christ." By the Rev. John Forbes, D. D., LL.D. (Deut. iii. 17, 18.)

"Lot's Flight from Sodom." By the late Rev. Robert Jeffrey. (Gen. xix. 15-17.) Note. This zealous and indefatigable man, who laboured so successfully for the interests of the Free Church, ordered this sermon to be sent to the publishers of the

Free Church Pulpit, only half an hour before his death. And among his last words, were "I feel my affection increasing for the GLORIOUS CAUSE, which is the cause of God.

"The love of the Father." By the Rev. Andrew A. Bonar. John vi. 36—40.

"The consolations of Christ adapted to the state and condition of his people." By the Rev. Robert S. Candlish, D.D.

"Duty of Prayer for the Peace of Jerusalem." Psalms cxxii. 6. By the Rev. Thomas Brown, D.D. (Preached at the opening of the General Assembly, May 16, 1844.)

"Reasons why men reject the righteousness of God." (Rom. x. 1—9.) By the Rev. James Hamilton of London.

"Religious Divisions." By the Rev. Andrew Grey, D.D. (Luke xii. 51.)

"Christ our High Priest." By the Rev. Horatius Bonar. (Exod. xxiii. 36—38.)

"On Goodness." (Acts xi. 24.) By the Rev. P. McFarlan, D.D.

"The Church and the World." (Dan. ii. 31—35.) By the Rev. Duncan McFarland, D.D.

"Isaiah's Vision of Christ's Glory." (Is. vi.) By the Rev. J. J. Bonar.

"The Excellency of Christian Knowledge." (Phil. iii. 8.) By the Rev. James Buchanan, D.D.

"The Necessity of testifying Repentance towards God, to the faithful preaching of the Gospel." (Acts xx. 21.) By the Rev. W. A. Thompson.

"Spiritual Death and Life." By the Rev. William Mackenzie. (Ephes. ii. 1.)

"The duty of Examining the signs of the Times." (Is. xv. 15.) By the Rev. Robert Buchanan, D.D.

"The character of Christ as the Shepherd of Israel." By the Rev. Robert Elder.

"The Nature of Prayer; the Answer of Prayer; and the Encouragement to Prayer." By the Rev. W. M. Hetherington, LL.D.

"The Blessedness of the Believer." By the late Rev. David Welch, D.D.

"The Intercession of Christ." By the late Rev. Henry Duncan, D.D.

"Jesus the only Saviour." By the Rev. James Begg, D.D.

"The soul sorrow of Jesus." By the Rev. J. Macnaughten.

"Self-evidencing Power of the Gospel." By the Rev. George Lewis.

"Christ's Death Effectual for the Salvation of the Elect only." By the Rev. Henry Moncreiff.

"Importunate Prayer," by the Rev. Robert Smith.

"Regeneration." By the late James Somerville, D.D.

"Conversion of Paul." By the Rev. James Ferguson, of London.

The reference to these sermons is not so much on account of their superior excellency, as because of the authors of most of them we have some knowledge. We have not, indeed, attempted any comparison of the sermons in this collection: such a comparison could not easily be made; for while one preacher excels in one respect, he is surpassed in some other respect by other preachers. Besides, comparisons of this kind, between the sermons of living preachers are often unjust, and always invidious. That sermon which is best to one, is not so to every body; tastes differ, and peculiar circumstances give a suitability and efficacy to truths presented in a particular manner, to some hearers or readers, when the same truths are not peculiarly adapted to the condition and feelings of others. Besides, the efficacy of preaching does not depend on the wisdom or eloquence of the preacher, but on the special blessing of God. Paul may plant and Apollos water, but it is God who giveth the increase. Sermons remarkably adapted to the gratification of a refined taste, are on that very account, not the best suited for edification; for it is a principle in the philosophy of the mind, that two different objects cannot be accomplished at one and the same time; if edification be our object, it must be our only one. In our opinion, excellence in preaching the gospel is the most important gift which any man can possess, and the attainment of it should call into requisition all the powers and exertions of the human mind.

To be a good preacher the man must possess, in the first place, a vigorous, well-balanced, and well-disciplined mind. He must possess a good degree of quickness of apprehension; but especially, a sound, discriminating judgment; a retentive memory, not so much of words as of ideas in their just connexion in a discourse. The power of logical reasoning is also ne-



cessary; false or sophistical reasoning in the pulpit is disgraceful and injurious to the truth. Even truth itself must not be corroborated by illogical arguments. The mind must be trained to a just and fair method of investigation; in which nothing is assumed as true, which is not self-evident, or capable of clear demonstration; and in which facts are stated with perfect candor and honesty. The imagination is of great importance to the preacher. We mean a fertile imagination, chastened and regulated by a sound judgment and correct taste. But a lively susceptibility of emotion is absolutely necessary to an impressive speaker. If we would make others feel, we must feel ourselves. It is feeling alone which can communicate the proper tones to the human voice; and when these are heard the very feeling which produced them is by a mysterious sympathy transferred into the minds of our hearers. Some speakers, indeed, possess far more melodious and expressive voices than others, but any voice which derives its tones from genuine feeling, however harsh, will be impressive. These natural tones may be artificially imitated; but the difference between the reality and the artificial imitation, is like that between the substance and the shadow. It may be objected, that the actors, who represent fictitious scenes, are able by their imitations of the proper expression of the passions, to affect their audiences in a very sensible degree. This is true; but all successful actors on the stage, produce the effect on their hearers, not by *imitating* the tones of feeling, but by exciting in themselves the feeling itself; otherwise, they could never succeed in producing the impression which they make on the feelings of the audience.

We once had the opportunity of hearing a very celebrated orator defending a man who had shot through the breast a neighbor in open day. We were curious to ascertain whether his effective oratory was a mere affectation of feeling, or whether he really felt what he said. The very first sentences which he uttered, convinced us irresistibly that his feeling was real and strong, and that he so made the case of his client his own, as to enter into all the emotions of his heart.

Various and extensive knowledge is also requisite to excellence in preaching. Every kind of learning is valuable to the public teacher of religion. The preacher should be able to bring out of his treasure things new and old. Knowledge

enlarges the mind and divests it of the prejudices, which are so apt to be imbibed by those whose views are circumscribed. The natural and physical sciences are really a part of natural theology, by which we read the divine attributes as exhibited in the book of nature. Astronomy is a noble science and agrees well with the studies and pursuits of the preacher. Geography and geology too, as relating to the globe on which we live, should not be neglected; and as the facts revealed by the latter seem, at first view, to conflict with the chronology of the Bible; every preacher should be able to obviate any objections which may arise from this quarter. The structure of the human body, and constitution of the human mind should be well understood by one who undertakes to enlighten the minds of others. And as to moral science, its fundamental principles form the basis of theology. A comprehensive knowledge of history is absolutely necessary to him, who would form just notions of the true character of man, and of the dispensations of divine Providence. But all the talents, knowledge, and mental discipline mentioned above, are not sufficient to make a good preacher, without genuine and lively piety. Even Cicero, a heathen, required that an orator should be a good man. But Cicero knew nothing of the scripture doctrine of divine influence. Every preacher should not only be a converted man, but his heart should glow with zeal for the glory of his Master, and should be warm with tender compassion for his fellow creatures. The pulpit is often spoken of, as though it were merely a theatre on which talent, taste, and learning, might be displayed to the admiration of a multitude of hearers. But, woe to the preacher, who ascends the sacred desk with such views as these. A double damnation will certainly be his doom, for he will not only be responsible for his own soul, but for those of his hearers, who perish through his neglect. The pulpit is an awful ordeal of a man's true character. If pride and ambition be predominant, here it will in all probability be manifested. There is no spot on the face of the earth, where Satan spreads his wiles, and plays off his stratagems more successfully than in the pulpit. He endeavours first to puff up; or, failing in this, he endeavours to cast the preacher down into discouragement. It will be one sign of the approach of the latter day glory, when the gift of preaching shall be granted, in an eminent degree, to many ministers. When

men like Paul, like Augustine, like Luther, like Whitefield, shall not appear as single stars in the firmament of the church; but brilliant constellation after constellation, shall arise and shine on Zion. Then the pulpit will be completely redeemed from the contempt into which it has fallen in many places. Then will Zion arise and shine, for the glory of the Lord will have arisen upon her. Then it will be manifest that the glorious Personage, seen in vision by the apostle John, is actually walking in the midst of the golden candlesticks, and holding the stars in his right hand.

These are not fancied scenes, the time will come when many burning and shining lights shall arise; when preachers like Whitefield, without Whitefield's faults—shall fly like a flame of fire through the earth, publishing glad tidings to all people. Then it may be said with emphasis, "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth salvation, that saith unto Zion THY GOD REIGNETH."

---

ART. V.—*Divine Providence: or the Three Cycles of Revelation, showing the parallelism of the Patriarchal, Jewish, and Christian dispensations. Being a new evidence of the Divine origin of Christianity.* By the Rev. George Croly, LL. D. London: James Duncan. 1834. pp. 627.

DOCTOR CROLY is well known to our readers as a gentleman of fine literary taste. He takes high rank as a writer both in poetry and prose; and has evinced his correct taste in a judicious selection of the British poets. In the department of history, he has written a life of George IV., with a memoir of his times; and in theology he has published among other works, a treatise of high character on the Apocalypse, and the work which we have placed at the head of this article. This volume is altogether unique in its character, and differs in its design and execution from any work that we remember to have seen. It is an elaborate treatise to prove the divine origin of Christianity, by showing a resemblance between the three dispensations—the Patri-

archal, Jewish, and Christian; and is characterized by profound thought, extensive reading, and literary ability. We award him the meed of honour which is justly his due on these accounts—while we confess that we differ from him in many of his premises, and are compelled to decline his conclusions.

The divine origin of Christianity is susceptible of proof infinitely various in kind and degree, and having withstood the assaults of its bitterest opponents, has gathered around it an array of evidence which it will be found exceedingly difficult to meet, and altogether impossible to overthrow. Every attempt to throw additional light upon this subject, has only tended to show how strong are its foundations; and even where the attempt has been weak and imperfect, infidelity has had no cause for triumph. It is, however to be regretted, that any effort should be made to sustain the divine origin of Christianity on insufficient grounds. Christianity can lose nothing by a full and free discussion of its claim; but it may be injured in the estimation of many thoughtful minds, by arguments based upon insufficient premises, or weak, and inconclusive in themselves. And while we hail with pleasure each successful attempt to prove Christianity true—not because it really needs such proof, but because it strengthens our own faith, and tends to convince the public,—we deprecate each attempt to prove it where the evidence is either inconclusive or doubtful. We cannot avoid the conclusion that Dr. Croly's work will prove of no benefit to the cause of Christianity by carrying conviction to the minds of the sceptical. It is interesting and instructive, but it is fanciful. It contains much rich and valuable information; but it is built upon a mere supposition, and as an argument is therefore of very little worth. It is, we believe, universally allowed, in Christendom, that the world may be, thus far, divided into three grand divisions of time, the Patriarchal, the Jewish, and the Christian. These three divisions or cycles of time, bear, in some respects, an analogy to each other, so as to exhibit a sameness of dealing on the part of God in them all. It is admitted also that what were termed the types of the Mosaic law—must be fulfilled in the subsequent dispensation. This our Lord repeatedly asserts. But He no where asserts that every feature of the Mosaic dispensation through all its history—was to be a type of something in the Christian; nor that it was



typified by some event or individual in that which preceded. We find no allusion to such an idea throughout the scriptures. That Adam was a type in some particular, of our Lord, is stated; but that Abraham was, that Enoch was, that Jacob and Joseph were; that their descendants typified the Christian world in such wise as that each person and event live over again in some other person or event,—the history of the past re-acted in the present,—we find no assurance and no testimony. It is upon this supposition that Dr. Croly has prepared his volume, and in endeavouring to maintain which, he has, as we think, signally failed. It would be easy to show an identity, or rather a resemblance in some respects, between three or even more eras of the world, but when it is undertaken to prove that Christianity is divine because the three or more dispensations are alike, we may reasonably ask for more light than we have hitherto been favoured with, or than Dr. Croly has thrown upon it in his volume. Could it be shown, beyond a question, that each succeeding dispensation was typified most accurately member to member by that which preceded it, no doubt could assail the most sceptical mind of the divine origin of each, and of God's providence over the whole. This Dr. Croly has attempted to do, and we think, has failed in the attempt, partly from the nature of the case, and partly from his having drawn largely on his imagination. What he proposed to do in this volume, we will let him tell in his own way.

“The most capable argument hitherto offered, is undoubtedly that arising from the consecutive nature of the three dispensations; for all that we can require for the truth of Christianity is, to prove that it has been the work of God. That fact once ascertained, its doctrines and promises must be received as they are given. But the succession of the three requires so much chastised and calm inquiry, which the indolence of scepticism will not undertake; and so much clearing away of matters originating solely in local circumstances, of which its prejudice is glad to take advantage; that hitherto few arguments have been less practically effectual.

“The argument proposed in the present volume differs from all that have preceded it, much in principle and totally in form. Its object is to prove that ‘Christianity is the direct work of Providence;’ and this, not by any mere probability arising from its

original weakness and subsequent power, nor from its moral superiority; nor from the sufferings undergone by sincere minds in its cause; nor even from its prophetic testimonies; but from the comparison of facts acknowledged by all, without reference to religious opinion. It will be shown that the leading facts of Christian history, have been the leading facts of the two former dispensations, Judaism and the Patriarchal religion; and that these facts have occurred in the three not merely in essence, but with the same purpose, and in the same order; yet that no mere dry sequence has been observed in the order of the respective dispensations, but they have received in each, those slight variations of shape and colour, which exhibit a superior adapting hand, varying the process, but distinctly preserving the principle.

"These facts in the Patriarchal dispensation were—that man first remained for a certain period in a state of which little more is known than that he existed—that he then became the father of two sons—that they offered sacrifices, of which one was rejected, and the other received—that the elder slew the younger, was deprived of his inheritance and exiled forever—that a third son was born to supply the place of the slain brother, that he became the founder of a sacred line—that his descendants grew corrupt—that they were swept away by a great, direct act of divine justice—that a remnant who had adhered to virtue, were preserved by the divine interposition—that from a state of suffering and desolation they were suddenly raised into a boundless dominion, and became the regenerators of the world—that a new apostacy arose,—grew singularly powerful, crushed the pure family of the patriarchal house, and finally, was in turn crushed by a direct interposition of Heaven. It will be shown that all these facts have been gone through *twice* subsequently, in the Jewish and Christian eras, with attendant circumstances, proving that Providence continued to exercise a constant provision for their performance, and for their suitability to the necessary changes arising from three states of mankind so totally distinct as those of the Patriarchal, the Jewish, and the Christian world."

There are minds singularly gifted with the faculty of tracing out resemblances and analogies, and we do not question that

there are very striking analogies between these three eras, nor yet that there are as striking between more than these. It is not our object to show that there are no such analogies, for this no candid mind would undertake to show; but that there are not such parallelisms as Dr. Croly contends for; that many of his supposed resemblances are more imaginary than real; and that he has rested upon insufficient grounds the truth of Christianity. If, indeed, his only object was to prove that the Providence of God presided over the three dispensations—we have no objections to this, and it can be easily proved. But when he undertakes to show, on the strength of certain analogies, that the one is the counterpart of the others, and that the minutest events of the one dispensation, are daguerreotyped upon the succeeding one—to re-appear in newer forms, and with fresher colouring, we feel disposed to ask, if, in the New Testament, there is the slightest allusion to this? If our Lord, or any of the New Testament writers ever refer to its likelihood? Or if we have the most distant intimations of such parallelism? And then, if the same or similar resemblances cannot be formed in other periods or cycles in the history of the world, or even in the history of any single nation? We feel persuaded that it can; and if so, where is the specific argument for Christianity drawn from this source? and when drawn, what is its worth? The argument for the Providence of God is one thing; the argument for Christianity is another.

“If three such series are established, maintaining this broad, plain, and unbroken parallelism with each other, it is utterly impossible to conceive that chance has had anything to do with the subject.”\*

This we admit, but this is not proving that Christianity is divine. The divinity of Christianity is a fact susceptible of proof; as much a fact, and as much susceptible of proof as any other fact. The simple question is, is the kind of proof adduced in this particular instance, any actual support to Christianity as a system of religion? Chance has had nothing to do with a thousand occurrences upon our world, but it would not hence follow that they were divine. It was not chance that originated Mohammedism, and the French Revolution, but it would be

difficult, we apprehend, to show that God is their author; much less, that they can claim an origin as divine as that of Christianity. It is a fault of some minds, that seizing analogies, they never know when to stop, but push them to the most unwarranted lengths. It is a beautiful idea, that there are three dispensations all parallel, and copies one of the other; but in the absence of any scriptural proof we do not see why these three should be parallel rather than some others. They constitute of themselves three great cycles of the world's history,—but this does not present sufficient ground for a parallel which is meant to prove Christianity in its details, divine; because a similar parallel can be traced throughout other portions of the history of our world. If the scriptures gave the slightest intimation of such a thing, we would bow implicitly to their revelation. But when, on the contrary, no such intimation is given, but the appeal is to “the law and the prophets,” we can but object to a theory, which, however laudable and pious the design, lays Christianity open to attack from the insufficiency of its principles, and the consequent inconclusiveness of its arguments. To show how far this theory is pushed, we make one more extract from the author's preface.

“It will be found, that not merely the nature and order of the leading facts in the three dispensations are exactly the same, but that the individual characters of the leading men and nations are the same; that individuals born two thousand years, and whole empires, asunder, have had precisely the same part in the several series; with the same character of mind, the same successes, and reverses; that Joseph in Egypt and St. Paul in Greece, that Ezra in Judea, and Luther in Germany, that Alexander in Asia, and Napoleon in Europe, have especially been the direct providential agents in the same departments of their series, and that among all the natural distinctions of country, objects, ability, and creed, they have been preserved in a singular adherence to the great predominating principle, of effecting the purposes of Heaven in the service of its revelation.” \*

We apprehend that Dr. Croly has by a strange oversight, committed a palpable mistake in this argument, confounding two things which ought to be kept essentially distinct. No one



doubts that Providence has framed and organized the dispensation under which we live at this present time. To prove a parallel, therefore, between this dispensation, and those which preceded it, would only go to prove that there was a guiding and over-ruling Providence over all. But this no more proves Christianity as a system of doctrine to be true, than it proves Mohammedism to be true; because as we have said, similar analogies may be traced between previous cycles, and that of Mohammed. If parallels are proofs, then it will be difficult to show why the proof is not as good for one as for another. To establish his point, he ought to show that the same leading doctrines were taught under all the dispensations. But, now the facts that Alexander was in Egypt, and did many things there, and that Napoleon was in Egypt, and did similar things there, can prove Christianity to be divine, we confess ourselves at a loss to understand. And yet Dr. Croly makes the parallel between Alexander and Napoleon to constitute an important link in his chain of proof.

"From the fall of the Babylonian empire (about B. C. 538,) to the Asiatic conquests of Alexander, Jerusalem was in the hands of the Persian emperor. It is with regret that the writer feels himself limited to a mere outline of the extraordinary, yet exact connection subsisting at this interesting period between the Jewish and Christian series. Nor must the reader be startled at the novelty of discovering the Persian empire to have taken its place in the providential system, as the prototype of Germany; Greece of France; and the founder of the brilliant and brief Macedonian empire, to have filled to the ancient world, the characteristic place and successes of the founder of the most dazzling and short-lived empire of modern days."\*

Dr. Croly's mind is of a highly imaginative cast, and while it is no cause for wonder that he should see resemblances and parallels in history, the liability with him is to cause these parallels to assume the form of type and anti-type. There is no more difficult question, probably, than what constitutes a type? By general consent, the word is applied almost exclusively, to those designed resemblances which are stated in the scriptures to have existed between persons and things in the

Jewish on the one hand, and the Christian dispensation on the other. Any two persons or things, therefore, in which we fancy we see a resemblance, can hardly be ranked as type and prototype. The instances are very few indeed, in which, in the New Testament, the events and persons of the old are spoken of as types, and it is doubtful whether we are at liberty to constitute any thing or person a type of another, simply because we find some singular resemblance between them. This imaginative cast of mind, has, we apprehend, led the author into some liberties with his subject which contribute to mar his work, and to spoil his theory. The first cycle he makes to begin with the creation—more properly with Adam—and to end with “the confusion of tongues.” The second cycle he carries forward from “the call of Abraham,” to the establishment of the Christian Church, through Constantine. Then, to make his third cycle, instead of taking up the second cycle where he made it end, he goes back to the time of Christ who certainly was before Constantine, and endeavours to run a parallel between Adam and Christ.\* But he has already run the parallel between Christianity and the former dispensations,† when making out the analogy in his second cycles. We are at a loss to conceive how he can go back over that cycle, and take out such events as he deems best, to run a parallel for this third period.

But this is only one instance of poetic license. He has given us others quite as extraordinary. With regard to one of these we will allow him to speak for himself. Under the head of “The Ante-diluvian patriarchs,” he says:

“It will be shown that a direct connection, an exact and unbroken parallelism, is maintained between the patriarchal period from Seth to Abraham, and the periods of the Jewish and Christian history; that not merely the periods retain an exact coincidence, but that even the *names* of the Patriarchs are descriptive of the *character* of the corresponding periods in the Jewish annals; and, in fact, that the whole of the ante-diluvian and post-diluvian record, down to the calling of Abraham, is not merely a history in the proper sense of the word, but also an actual series of prophecy.”‡

He then takes the Patriarchal generation from Seth to Noah,

\* Chap. xliv. p. 436.

† Chap. xxxviii. p. 473.

‡ Chap. xvi. p. 228.

and with the interpretation of each patriarchal name, endeavours to discover a resemblance in some corresponding part of Jewish history. How he does this we will show. He takes the name of Seth, which signifies "appointed" or "put," given probably because he was appointed in place of Abel. He designates the period of his generation as 205 years—(we suppose to the nativity of Enos.) He then considers Abraham to have been called B. C. 1962; add 205 years to this date of Abraham's life, and he is brought into B. C. 1757. But what is the application of a parallel between Seth and Abraham? Why this. Seth was named *appointed* and Abraham was *appointed*—not by himself but with his son Isaac, to be the head of the Jewish church! But 1757 reaches rather farther than Abraham's day, and as he must make out the 205 years in some way, he stretches it over the whole history of Isaac, and by his own adopted system of chronology makes it run far into the history of Jacob. This, of course is a small matter; for a few years "more or less, are nothing in a scale of hundreds, particularly in the general difficulty existing as to the *exact* dates, in all the chronological systems."\*

The periods which he next compares, are those of Enos and Jacob. That of Enos, he considers to have embraced about 190 years, and he desires, of course, to draw the parallel with that of Jacob. Enos means *despairing*. But where is the analogy? Why, he says of Jacob, that his whole life is marked with trouble. But this does not make the parallel, because it does not appear that Jacob ever despaired. This is true, but there is no difficulty in the matter, for "his descendants fall into still deeper trial," the national characteristics being slavery and despair!†

To mention only a few other instances of this species of romancing, we pass over a number of patriarchs until we come to the name of Peleg. Peleg means *division*. The name was given him because in his days the earth was to be divided. Dr. Croly reckons his generation as 130 years: and makes the parallel extend from A. D. 471 to 601. "In the fifth and sixth centuries, the Western Empire . . . was *divided* into separate sovereignties."\*

\* p. 230, note.

† p. 231.

‡ p. 243.

SERUG means *branching*. His generation includes 130 years; and this period embraces from A. D. 733, to 863; "this was peculiarly the age of *conversion*."\*

TERAH means *breathing*. His generation includes 70 years. The corresponding period is A. D. 942 to 1012. Dr. Croly must have been seriously troubled here, one would think, to find an analogy in this period to that of *breathing*. But he is not so troubled as we would suppose. He finds the parallel in the Paulicians who undertook in the west to reform some of the abuses in the church!†

If it were not too serious a matter, we should be disposed to laugh over such childish fancies. And it is humiliating to find a man, a divine of Dr. Croly's genius, so perfectly enamoured of these puerilities, as to descend to the tracing out analogies where imagination alone can find their existence.

There is much in this volume to indicate the possession of great abilities. Had he given his mind to the solution of scriptural difficulties; to an exhibition of the aids which science can render to the cause of religion, he would, we are persuaded, have produced a work or works which would have stood the test of criticism, and have proved of lasting benefit to the world. But it is, to say the least, undignified and unbecoming for a man of his intellectual abilities, to waste his powers upon such trifles as these we have mentioned. We do not question that he deems himself to be doing Christianity some service. We have reason to think otherwise. If ever religion has had to lay down its propositions unqualifiedly, and present its most rigid demonstrations, it is at the present time. Nothing ought to be left to conjecture. And the only effect which this work can have on thoughtful minds, will be to disgust them with fancies which would have been by no means creditable even to the boyhood of the author. We speak thus strongly, because Dr. Croly lays great stress in his preface upon the parallelism which he traces throughout his volume, as an overwhelming argument against scepticism, and as affording the only sure foundation on which the sceptic can be met. We have been so unfortunate as never to have met with the man upon whom this argument would have the least salutary effect.

\* p. 249.

† p. 254.



It is time, however, to proceed with some of the parallels of the third cycle. Dr. Croly begins the personal parallel with that between Joseph and the apostle Paul.\* When we noticed this, we are free to confess, we wondered in what the likeness consisted. We had seen frequent attempts made to run the parallel between Joseph and our Lord; but it was entirely a new idea—that one existed between Joseph and the apostle Paul. The parallel is made out ingeniously to say the least. Joseph was the son of Jacob's old age, and was the *brother* of Benjamin. Paul of Tarsus was employed by, and enjoyed the confidence of, the Sanhedrim, and was moreover of the *tribe* of Benjamin. To make anything of a parallel here, Saul should have been the son of another tribe. As it happened, he was the son of Benjamin. While Joseph was Benjamin's brother. But Joseph had a new coat given him by his father. Dr. Croly says "it was a *sudden* mark of honour." Perhaps so—but as the Mosaic narrative gives us no hint upon this point, it is as well not to be too wise even in small matters. All we know is that it was "a coat of many colors;" perhaps more correctly a coat of many *pieces*. We are almost afraid to state to those who have never read the work, what is the parallel here. But Dr. Croly has deliberately recorded his firm conviction that the parallel is found in the sudden splendour of the Divine presence which shone around Saul when on his journey to Damascus!

Joseph was sent by his father to see his *shepherd* brethren; they conspire to slay him; he is delivered out of their hands and is sold a slave into Egypt; Jacob mourns for him, and will not be comforted. Our author is never at a loss, and his ingenuity finds an analogy without the least difficulty. "Paul, clothed in the garb of an apostle, went forth to visit the shepherd and the flock of Israel by the command of the great Father of all." They conspired against him, and sought to slay him; Felix designed to *loose* him, but—like Reuben when he left his brother in the pit to gratify his brethren—"willing to do the Jews a pleasure, he *left Paul bound*;" and whilst still bound, Paul was sent a *prisoner*—not to Egypt, but to Rome. How our author could impose upon himself so strangely, as to pen

\* p. 258.

these words in this connection—"The closeness of detail in the correspondence is striking;"\* passes our comprehension; and when he adds these reflections to the narrative. "The minute exactness of circumstances so important to the general narrative, yet so admirably adapted to mark identity, is demonstrative of design; and this design also furnishes an answer to a very striking question."† We wonder at the fascination of a theory which can see that which is not to be seen; but we wonder, most of all, at the wildness of Dr. Croly.

We pass over much of a similar character, and pause to notice his parallel of Moses. The same ingenuity is required here, that we have elsewhere seen to be necessary. The parallel of Moses—is Constantine.‡ Dr. Croly appears to think that this is rather too large a draft upon our credulity, and he significantly adds, "Still, dissimilar as Moses and Constantine are to the eye, kindred peculiarities are impressed on both, which guide the mind to their unity of purpose."

The dissimilarity is certainly very striking to the eye; and we are not—perhaps we ought to be—ashamed to confess, that our minds are not guided to their unity of purpose. The only point in which we can trace the faintest resemblance is the guidance of Moses by a pillar of cloud, and the appearance of a vision to Constantine. This is enough for Dr. Croly, although this is but one small point of resemblance. Moses was born in Egypt, and, though of an obscure family, was of the tribe of Levi—"one of the princes of Israel." He was taken from his mother, and was adopted by the daughter of Pharaoh. "The chief features of Constantine's career observe a close and unequivocal correspondence with those of the Jewish leader." The father of Constantine was the son of a chief noble in Dardania, though at the time of his son's birth, he was in comparative obscurity. Constantine was separated in his boyhood from his mother, who had been divorced by his father on occasion of his becoming one of the Cæsars. *Constantine thus became the son of a princess!* Now it appears that Constantine *was* separated from his mother; and it appears that Moses *was not*. The last mention of Moses's mother leaves her with him at the palace. Constantine was the son of a prince. Moses

\* p. 559.

† p. 563.

‡ p. 571.

was nothing of the sort. His father was a poor slave doomed to work in the brick kilns of Egypt. Moses was guided day by day, and night by night, by a pillar of cloud and fire, through forty years of painful and weary pilgrimage. Constantine, when on his march, saw—not through forty years, but for one day, perhaps only for one short moment—a vision of a cross in the Heavens! And this is one of the beautiful parallelisms which we are asked to receive as yielding such powerful testimony to the truth of Christianity. Testimony too which is to shake the very ground from beneath the sceptic, and to leave him without a solitary spot on which he can even rest the sole of his foot. Alas! it is not the first time that splendid talents have been employed on folly; or in which a beautiful theory has been blown to its own destruction. Dr. Croly caught sight of the beauties of a bubble, and in his ardent admiration of these, he gave himself up to the illusion that his bubble was the grand contrivance by which all error was to be removed, and the world reformed.

We have purposely reserved until this place, another parallel which the Dr. has attempted to run, and of which, with remarkable confidence, he exclaims, "It absolutely cuts off every subterfuge of scepticism." It is that between Alexander and Napoleon. Before remarking at length upon this attempted parallel, we wish to observe that there are some very remarkable points of resemblance both in the character of the men, and in the circumstances of their history. We shall have occasion to refer to these. We only wish in this place to enter our protest against the admission of such resemblance being tortured into an argument for the truth of Christianity. We are unable to see the argument; and cannot, therefore discern the assistance that it renders to the cause of Christianity. But to the parallel. Alexander was born at Pella in Macedon. Napoleon was born in Corsica. Pella was a sterile territory; and Corsica was a little wild spot—so Seneca said, but about which there appears to be some difference of opinion. It would have hurt the parallel, but Dr. Croly might as well have said that Pella was at one time the capital of Macedon, and therefore was a much more important place than Corsica. Alexander was educated by Aristotle, and Napoleon was educated at the military school of Brienne in France. The plunder of the Delphian temple

prepared the way for a revolution in Greece which overthrew Philip and his government. The plunder of the church prepared the way for the French revolution. Alexander was the son of the Macedonian king and succeeded to his throne; but it is very certain that Napoleon was not the son of a French king. Alexander invaded Asia Minor, and over-ran it in two campaigns, and then compelled the Persian monarch to treat for peace. He contemplated the mastery of the Mediterranean sea, and conquered Tyre and Egypt. Alexander demanded that he should be recognised as king of Asia. Napoleon did nothing of the kind; but when on the celebration of peace the *Te Deum* was chanted, he only forced back the Austrian ambassador who would have taken precedence in the procession. A beautiful and striking parallel on which to found an argument which was "absolutely to cut off every subterfuge of scepticism?" Napoleon could not conquer Tyre, and so he conquered Alexandria; and then over-ran Egypt. Alexander visited the temple of Jupiter Ammon which he reached after twelve days of fearful suffering. Napoleon sought, not the temple of Jupiter Ammon, but the Mamalukes, and after fourteen days of suffering caught sight of them and of the pyramids! \* But enough of such pretence of learning. We cannot consent to wade through the puerility which perverted ingenuity has contrived to bring together in this chapter. It only shows how small the subjects on which a really great mind will condescend to be employed; and how absorption in a theory will contribute to the suspension for a time, of all the nobler faculties, and to a strange obliquity of mental perception. The powers which might be profitably employed upon other matters, become weakened by confinement upon a doubtful theory, and points which no other person can see to bear the least resemblance to each other, are seen, through a perverted medium, to be singularly harmonious. The enthusiasm of Dr. Croly upon the main subject of his volume is perfectly astonishing. He ranks this subject above almost every thing else. He considers the evidence which it yields to Christianity, superior to that adduced from any other quarter; and, as if intoxicated with delight at the splendours of his discovery, he pronounces in a tone of the utmost confidence, that every sub-

• Chapter xlix. pp. 591—621.



terfuge of scepticism is absolutely cut off. A recent reviewer has well and truly said that "Philosophers are but too apt to forget, when they make hypotheses for difficult cases, under the stress of such logical necessities, that a truer logic would teach them that when they have no other solution than fanciful assumptions, they had better leave them alone."\* We say with regard to the subject of the present work that the fanciful assumptions are abundant, and that true logic would teach Dr. Croly to leave them all alone. How he could avoid seeing that his parallels were not parallels; that his fancy alone has made divergent histories appear as though running side by side, in beautiful conformity, we are puzzled to comprehend. So it is, however. He never dreams of any possibility of mistake. He is enwrapped in the creations of his own bright fancies, and deluded with the idea that by his work he will give the death blow to infidelity, he gives himself up to the hallucination, and sees parallelisms every where.

The world is not wanting in works on the Evidences of Christianity—works from Paley to Channing, stamped with great mental power, and with a logical accuracy which has effectually precluded all reply. It may be that there are minds which while they cannot reply to these learned and lucid arguments, are not, and will not be, convinced by their reasoning. Could it be shown that such parallelism exists as Dr. Croly has represented, it would—we should think—go far to remove all ground of objection. But, as we before remarked, with no assurance of this parallelism, the evidence of its existence ought to be singularly clear and unquestionable. If any body could detect it, we are sure Dr. Croly could; and if he has not succeeded we are sure the failure has not been owing to his own deficiency of ingenuity, but because there was no parallel to detect. We have thought, as we have read this work, what effect would be wrought upon the mind of any intelligent sceptic by the perusal? Would he feel that every subterfuge was swept away? that his ground had slid from beneath him? and that he was utterly silenced? Would he be thoroughly convinced? We trow not. We find much that is curious, much that is interesting; but we find more that has little authority

save in the fancy of the author. It is a beautiful idea, certainly, that the three dispensations unfold into each other, so that the persons and events of the one are mirrored upon the other, the persons and events of the first dispensation living over again in the persons and events of the other two, not in *propria persona*, but in new and brighter characters. Could this idea be sustained? Could history show upon her faithful page, a perfect record of all this, it would be an overwhelming evidence in favour of the Providence of God. But to constitute it an evidence in favour of Christianity, would require a perfect parallel in all its parts, and a perfect accordance of the truths of the three dispensations. The sceptic does not deny the facts of the Christian history. He denies its truths. To prove to him an agreement in the facts while no such agreement is shown between the truths, is to leave his doubts unresolved and even untouched. We do not see that Dr. Croly has done aught that he proposed to do. He framed a beautiful theory, but mistook, most singularly, its bearing. He deemed that he had discovered an argument which would prove an ægis impenetrable to the shafts of infidelity. But when we apply the theory, we find that he has altogether mistaken his object—having confounded two things entirely distinct. There is no discrepancy between Christianity and the Providence of God, but they are not the same thing; and to confound an argument for divine providence, with an argument for Christianity, is about as singular a mistake as any author could well be guilty of.

We have said that Dr. Croly has recorded some singular parallels. It will be interesting to our readers to notice a few of these. The student of ancient history will recollect that when Alexander entered Egypt, he proclaimed himself a worshipper of Apis, and according to the historian, "He assisted in the ceremony, and not to leave the effect negative, he sent to Greece for the persons most eminent as public performers in all the amusements of the theatre." *Mitford*, vol. vii. The first act of Napoleon, on taking possession of Egypt, was to publish to his troops the decree that he recognised fully and freely the worship of Mohammed. "I respect"—was his language—"more than the Mamelukes ever did, God, His Prophet, and the Koran, Sheiks and Imams! assure the people that *we also* are true Musselmans." This coincidence is to say the least, remarkable;

and whether or not—Napoleon purposely copied the wretched policy of Alexander—it is surprising that both should have practised such consummate duplicity in the same land, under the same circumstances, and in the same particulars. Another coincidence is found in the sudden return of the two conquerors to their homes. When Alexander was preparing to visit the antiquities of Upper Egypt, he was suddenly recalled by intelligence that the Persian King was collecting his forces. He found on his arrival at Tyre, that an attempt was made in Greece to dissolve the confederacy, and that the Lacedæmonians had taken up arms to form a new league; Darius having assisted them, as it is supposed, with money. Alexander repressed the insurrection, *suddenly left Egypt*, and prepared for another invasion of the Persian dominions. Napoleon was in Syria when he received news from France, at once of reverses in Italy, and of the difficulties which involved the government. He instantly embarked with sudden resolution for France, when he crushed his opponents, remodelled the state, and made himself first consul. There is here a coincidence—we do not say a very striking one—for we do not think that it is. It is just such a coincidence as can be traced in many histories, and on which we should never think of building an argument in favour of Christianity. It is a coincidence, and that is all. But when Dr. Croly adds in all seriousness—for he is serious—that it is another remarkable parallel that Alexander was twenty-five years of age, and Napoleon *thirty*,\* we are disposed to smile at the fond idolatry with which he worships his theory.

But it would be doing Dr. Croly great injustice not to say that there are many things in his volume which we have read with interest, and instruction. The first fourteen chapters embracing a great variety of topics, contain discussions which indicate decided ability, and lead us to wonder that the author has not confined his attention to the elucidation of scriptural difficulties for which we think him especially qualified. His chapter on "Creation," and that on "The Mosaic Geology," we have thought especially interesting, although not prepared to endorse every opinion. That on "The Flame of the Cheru-

bim," contains an explanation of that subject which we do not remember to have seen, although it is probable that it has been advanced before. The Mosaic narrative records, that "God placed at the gate of Eden, cherubim, and a flaming sword which turned every way to keep the way of the tree of life." There is a difficulty here contained in the expression "to keep the way of the tree of life." Does it mean that this celestial guard was to point out the way of the tree of life? or that it was to shield the pathway from encroachment? Dr. Croly in answering these questions, adopts the following theory. He supposes that man, after his expulsion from Eden, was debarred access to the tree of life, and that the flaming cherubim was meant to serve as an oracle for future generations to consult. This exposition involves, of course, the existence of the garden of Eden after the Fall, and Dr. Croly thinks he derives fresh strength to his theory from the language of the historian—that *Cain was driven out from the presence of the Lord*. This is plausible, and as a theory we have no special objection to it. The whole passage, indeed the whole narrative, is confessedly a difficult one, and its exposition is rendered more difficult because of the little light thrown upon it by other portions of the sacred writings. Dr. Croly considers the expression we have just quoted to mean a *local presence*, and thinks it can mean nothing else. We are not certain of this. The same, or a similar phrase, is used in other portions of the sacred writings, where we do not understand a local presence, and we see no necessity for a resort to that theory here. The idea is a beautiful one—that the presence of God was always visible in some way at the gate of Eden, and always accessible to man; but we see no special authority for it, nor do we think that the narrative teaches it. Still we are not disposed to be hypercritical; because, whether the glory of the Lord was, or was not visible at the entrance of Eden, the opposite theory cannot affect any great question, while the silence of the scriptures shows its comparatively little importance.

His conjectures on "the site of Paradise" are adopted mainly from Rennell's Geography of Herodotus, and Faber's Origin of Pagan idolatry. He supposes it to have been in one of the valleys of Armenia, "near the sources of the Tigris and Euphrates," and his reasoning is, to say the least, plausible. But it has always appeared to us, an useless subject for discussion,



inasmuch, as if the site could be discovered, we should suppose it would have been before this. The most extraordinary thing connected with it, is, that the traditions of the countries around the supposed site, are silent upon its location. It is true that the geographical boundaries as recorded by Moses are very distinctly defined; but the deluge has intervened, and Rosenmiller has very justly observed "*Fluvius ille ex quo quatuor alii orti sunt, hodie frustra quaeritur.*" And since the river is not now to be found, and since the traditions of the country are all silent upon its location, we can know no more at present than that Eden was.

We have reviewed Dr. Croly's work somewhat at length, because we deem it objectionable in the main features to which our review has extended. The author has drawn rather more largely upon his fancy than is either expedient, or consistent with the rigid reference to facts which his argument really required. His argument was eminently one that appealed to facts. It had based itself rigidly on these, and should, therefore, have looked to them alone, discarding all that was merely theoretical, and which history would not most thoroughly sanction. He undertook to build a splendid structure of evidence in favour of Christianity, which no honest ingenuity could answer. It was to be composed of solid and parallel facts—facts as thoroughly parallel as though squared and fitted to each other by design. But we find many of his facts anything but parallel, and his conclusions singularly inconsequent. We can scarcely conceive a greater failure. Had he shown his manuscript to any intelligent friend before putting it to press, we incline to the opinion that the volume in its present aspect—as a treatise in favour of Christianity—would not have appeared. As a treatise on divine providence, the work is exceedingly curious, and very interesting. As a treatise on the evidences of Christianity it is utterly worthless. In nothing ought he to have been more careful. In nothing could he have been more careless. He has exercised much judgment in the early chapters in which his main argument is not touched; but in the very portion where all his matureness of judgment was needed, because it was the pith of his whole work, he assumes a loftier and more confident tone, but seems to lay aside his solidity of judgment, and to be afflicted with an obliquity of vision. If any sceptic shall be

convinced by his work to believe Christianity to have come from God, we shall rejoice to know it, but it will be owing, more to the merits of the cause than to the merits of the arguments adduced for its support. Real evidence in favour of Christianity is always of service, because there are some minds which will always find in such evidence an adaptation to their peculiar modes of thought; and we never accustom ourselves to look with indifference, much less with contempt, upon any argument, which, though not characterized by profoundness of thought, or originality, is yet faultless as regards its premises and conclusions. Learning and talent may not need it, but there are minds which may be assisted by it, and led to an abandonment of a cheerless infidelity. But such is not the case with the work before us. Its premises are questionable—when they ought to be beyond the reach of doubt, and its conclusions therefore cannot be expected to be perfectly satisfactory. It is designed especially for thoughtful minds, and by the very novelty of its subject is calculated to arrest the attention, and by the ingenuity of the discussion to fix it. We are sorry not to be able to say as much for its ability to convince the judgment. In this the only really important point, there is an essential and pervading fault which renders useless the whole volume; and in contrast with the lofty pretensions, and high sounding empiricism of the work, renders the failure little short of ridiculous.

---

ART. VI.—*A Manual of Presbytery* (comprising tracts by the Rev. Dr. Miller of Princeton and the Rev. Mr. Lorimer of Glasgow.) Second edition, revised and enlarged. Edinburgh. John Johnstone. 1848. 8vo.

If it be true, as we believe, that there is no order of ministers superior to presbyters, now existing by divine appointment in the Christian Church, either as the successors of the primitive bishops, who were themselves no more than elders, or as the successors of the primitive apostles, who, in that capacity, had no successors; it follows, as a necessary consequence, that presbyters or elders, being thus the highest class of officers existing

by divine right in the church, must be invested with the highest powers now belonging to the ministry, including those of discipline and ordination, so that there cannot be higher ministerial authority than that which is derived from presbyters. This negative proof might be considered amply sufficient for the vindication of our orders from the charge of invalidity, so far as it is founded on the want of what is called an episcopal organization in our churches. To remove all doubt, however, and present the truth in both its aspects, we propose to exhibit, in a positive form, direct proof of the fact that presbyters, as presbyters, possessed and exercised the highest powers now belonging to the ministry, even in apostolic times, from which we may infer *a fortiori*, that the same authority is vested in them now.

It will be recollected, that the presbyterial office is coeval with the church, and that Paul and Barnabas, during their missionary tour in Asia Minor, not only planted churches, but "ordained them elders in every city." If then we can discover with what powers these early presbyters were clothed, we shall establish a sure basis for our subsequent inquiries. And in this investigation we are greatly aided by the preservation, in the Acts of the Apostles, of a valedictory address by Paul to certain persons of this class, when he was leaving Greece and Asia Minor for Jerusalem; in which address, we find not only strong expressions of his private feelings, and allusions to his ministerial labours, but advice to those whom he addressed, as to the right discharge of their official duties. It affords us, therefore, evidence, as to the functions of the primitive elders, which is none the less interesting or instructive, because furnished incidentally.

The statement here referred to is recorded in the twentieth chapter of Acts, where we read that "Paul had determined to sail by Ephesus, because he would not spend the time in Asia," "and from Miletus he sent to Ephesus, and called the elders of the church." When they were come, he appealed to them as witnesses of his fidelity to the churches of that region, in declaring unto them all the counsel of God. He then announces to them that their personal connexion was dissolved forever, and exhorts them to the diligent performance of the duties which would thenceforth be peculiarly incumbent on them. And in so doing, it is worthy of remark, that he makes no allusion to

the intended substitution of another in his place, as their official guide and counsellor, but speaks to them precisely as he might, or rather must, have spoken, on the supposition, that from that time forth they were themselves to exercise the highest powers in the church of Ephesus. If he had still expected them to act as mere inferiors and assistants, he would naturally, not to say necessarily, have comforted their grief at his departure, by the promise of a competent successor, and in warning them of dangers by which their church was menaced, would of course have exhorted them to faithful and diligent co-operation with their bishop. But the passage contains nothing of all this; a circumstance which, though it may prove little by itself, as to the organization of the church at Ephesus, affords, at least, an instance of remarkable coincidence with that hypothesis which we maintain, and, what is more important to our present purpose, fully justifies the inference, that the powers here ascribed to the Ephesian presbyters were powers to be exercised in virtue of their presbyterial character, and not by delegation from a higher class of permanent church-officers. For if the apostle could direct them to perform these acts, not only without making his own presence and concurrence a prerequisite, but in such terms as really exclude it, how much less reason have we to believe, that their validity was meant to be dependent on the sanction of a bishop, who is not so much as mentioned, and of whose existence we have no proof elsewhere.

Nor is this a mere negative deduction from Paul's silence, as to any superior authority at Ephesus; for the same thing is implied in the choice of his expressions. "Take heed, therefore, unto yourselves,"—*therefore*, since you are now to be deprived of the extraordinary, temporary supervision which you have enjoyed, and to be left with the whole burden of the church upon you, under this change of circumstances, you must be watchful on your own account, not only for your personal safety and advantage, but for that of the church also—"take heed, therefore, unto yourselves, and to all the flock,"—not the flock of another shepherd, but their own, for which they were directly responsible—"over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers," ἐπισκόπους or bishops. The bearing of this usage of the term upon the question of episcopal organization has been often discussed elsewhere. What is here important to



be noticed is, that these Ephesian presbyters were shepherds of God's flock, not described as under-shepherds, that is, as the deputies of any human shepherd, but as constituted such by God himself, and that not merely by his providential dispensations, but by a special designation of the Holy Ghost. This explicit mention of the *jus divinum* under which they acted, when viewed in connexion with the absence of all reference to any higher local power, either actual or prospective, makes it not only improbable, but scarcely possible, that what they are empowered or required to do, was to be done by delegation, or in any other way than by direct authority from God himself, bestowed upon them as the highest permanent and local rulers of the church of Ephesus.

With these views of the character in which the elders are addressed, and of the right by which their functions were to be discharged, let us now endeavour to determine in the same way, what these functions were. The answer to this question is afforded by the words immediately succeeding those already quoted: "Take heed, therefore, unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, TO FEED THE CHURCH OF GOD, which he hath purchased with his own blood." As the church has been already represented as a flock, the official duty of these elders towards it is described by a cognate metaphor. The exact correspondence of the terms is less apparent in our version than in the original, where the word rendered *flock*, and that rendered to *feed*, are collateral derivatives from a common root, and stand in the same relation to the word which means *a shepherd*. To the verb, both etymology and usage give the sense, not of *feeding* merely, but of *acting as a shepherd, doing a shepherd's duty*, of which feeding is a most essential part, but not by any means the whole, since it would either be impossible or unavailing, without further care in guiding to the fold and to the pasture, in collecting and reclaiming, in protecting from the weather and from beasts of prey, and in other slight but indispensable attentions, all included in the literal vocation of a shepherd, and in both the literal and the figurative import of the Greek verb which Paul uses. Unless then the English verb to *feed* be taken with such latitude of meaning as to comprehend all this, it no more expresses the whole duty of a shepherd (as the Greek word does), than the verb to *shoot* describes

the business of a soldier or a hunter, or *to plough* that of a farmer. It is highly important that our exposition of this passage should be wholly unaffected by a prejudice, connected only with the English version, and arising from its failure to express the full sense of Paul's phraseology. Even when figuratively used, the verb *ποιμαίνω* is employed by the Greek writers to denote, not merely *nourishment*, but *care*, in the most extensive sense of the expression, such care as faithful shepherds give to helpless and dependent flocks. If, then, the church at Ephesus was a spiritual flock, and these its elders spiritual shepherds, the duty here enjoined upon them is not merely that of "feeding them with knowledge," by public and private teaching, but also that of governing, controlling, and protecting them, as well from the effects of internal corruption, as from those of violence and fraud *ab extra*. It is, in short, a metaphorical description of the ministerial office, in its whole extent, as comprehending all that is essential to the continued existence of the church, and the attainment of the ends for which it was established, just as the business of a shepherd comprehends all that is necessary to the safety and well being of the flock. There is no more reason in the text itself, for excluding any of the ministerial functions from the figurative import of the verb *ποιμαίνειν*, than there is for excluding some things in the nature and condition of the church from the figurative import of the substantive *ποιμνίον*; if the latter is a general description of the church, the former is a general description of the ministry, its duties and its powers. And this, which is the natural and obvious meaning of the figurative terms which the apostle uses, agrees, in all points, with his subsequent expressions. "For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves"—a common figure for false teachers—"enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them." These are the two great evils, with which the church was threatened, error of doctrine, and schism as the consequence; for this is the relative position of the two things, as described in scripture, not the converse, as maintained by those who make purity of doctrine to depend upon external regularity, as we shall see hereafter. To prevent these evils, whether threatened from within or from without, and to prevent

them, not by private effort merely, but by authoritative action, is distinctly made the duty of the presbyters of Ephesus.

That the apostle refers not to personal but official influence, appears from the solemn mention of their designation by the Holy Ghost, with which he prefaces his exhortation. There would be something quite incongruous in making the divine right of these presbyters the ground of an injunction which was equally binding upon all true Christians. This would be tantamount to saying, since the Holy Ghost has placed you in a high official station, be assiduous in personal and private duties. If, on the other hand, the reference is clearly to the influence exerted by these presbyters, as such, and in the exercise of their distinctive functions, then the question meets us, how could they comply with this injunction, unless they were intrusted with the keys both of discipline and doctrine, with the power, not of teaching merely, but of maintaining purity of doctrine, by deciding controversies, trying heretics, silencing false teachers, and excluding from the ministry all such as were esteemed by them unfaithful or unfit? But these are acts supposing the possession of the highest powers now belonging to the ministry, not merely those of preaching and of ordinary pastoral control, but also those of ministerial discipline and ordination.

It may be objected, that the duty, to which the elders, in the next verse, are specifically called, is not that of judging or of acting with authority, but merely that of watching and remembering his former admonitions, and that this implies the existence of a higher power which alone was competent to check the evil. But if this be so, how is it, that he does not even mention or allude to such superior power? It cannot be imagined, that he merely meant to terrify the elders by predicting future evils to the church, without suggesting a preventive or a remedy; and yet this is undoubtedly the case, if those whom he addresses could do nothing more than watch and bear in mind his warnings. If it be said, that the elders must have been aware of the existence of these "higher powers," and needed not to be informed of it by Paul, it then becomes impossible to understand why he addressed his exhortations to the presbyters, and not to their superiors, who alone had power to prevent or remedy the threatened evil. Nor can this difficulty

be removed by taking it for granted, first, that there was a bishopric of Ephesus, above the eldership, and then that it was vacant, so that Paul was under the necessity, at this time, of addressing the "inferior clergy." For in that case he could hardly have omitted all allusion to the fact assumed, and all injunction to obey the bishop, when he should be sent, and co-operate with him for the prevention of the evils to be feared; whereas he seems, as we have seen, to throw the whole responsibility upon the elders, and addresses them precisely as he must have done, if he expected and intended the entire care of the Ephesian church to be devolved on them. To take the contrary for granted, in despite of the obvious tenor of Paul's language, is, in effect, to destroy the value of all proof derived from language, except in the case of an explicit, categorical assertion, which is granted, upon all sides, to be wanting here. A simple test of probability, in this case, is afforded by the fact, that no one, reading the apostle's exhortation, either could or would derive from it the notion of an ecclesiastical authority at Ephesus, above that of the presbyters, to whom the exhortation is addressed; and on the other hand, that no one so reading it, could fail to gather from it, in itself considered, that these elders were invested with official right and power to prevent or to redress the evils here predicted.

The truth is that the other supposition rests upon the foregone conclusion, that a prelatical authority, distinct from the presbyterate, did certainly exist at Ephesus, and that the subjection of the elders to it is implied or presupposed in the apostle's exhortation. But denying, as we do, that any proof of such authority exists in any quarter, and interpreting Paul's language by itself and by the context, without reference to any preconceived hypothesis whatever, we are forced to the conclusion, that he here addresses the Ephesian elders as the rulers of the church, and that when he exhorts them to be watchful and remember, he refers not to private but official vigilance, and to such a recollection of his warnings as should lead to the due exercise of their authority in quenching the insidious fires of heresy and schism, which they could not do without possessing all the power which a bishop, or derivative apostle, on the opposite hypothesis, could possibly have exercised. The objection to this argument from this address of Paul, that it does not



ascribe to the Ephesian elders the specific powers of discipline and ordination, proves too much; for it would prove that they were not even authorized to preach or to administer the sacraments, since these are not specifically mentioned, though included in the figurative meaning of *ποιμαίνειν*, which, however, includes more, and is descriptive of the ministerial work in general, as we have seen already. The apostle speaks of them, either as having all the ministerial powers, or as having none; because the terms which he employs are those of general description, not minute specification, and must either be descriptive of the office as a whole, or not at all.

But even granting, for the sake of argument, that *ποιμαίνειν* merely means *to feed*, and that feeding is a metaphor for preaching and the sacraments, it does not follow, that the powers of discipline and ordination, although not specifically mentioned, are excluded. It is clear, not only that the whole includes its parts, but also that the greater may include the less. As the general ascription of the ministerial powers to these elders would imply that they possessed each separately, so too the ascription of a higher ministerial power might imply that they possessed a lower. Now discipline and ordination, it will be admitted, derive their value from the ends which they promote, and which they were intended to secure. The end of discipline is to preserve purity, and to exclude the unworthy from the privileges of the church. The end of ordination is to secure a valid ministration of the word and sacraments. But the word and the sacraments themselves have an independent and intrinsic value. If the power of dispensing them had been conferred on any who thought proper to make use of it, without any special ordination to an office, whatever inconveniences might have attended that arrangement, it could not have impaired the intrinsic value of the word and sacraments. But if, on the other hand, there were no word or sacraments, ordination would be useless. And the same may be said, *mutatis mutandis*, as to government or discipline. These then, to wit, ordination and discipline, are subsidiary functions, which derive their value from the relation they sustain to others. The possession of these powers, therefore, might have been inferred from the possession of the higher powers upon which they are dependent, even if the latter had alone been mentioned. But the fact, as we have seen

already, is, that all the powers of the ministry collectively are comprehended in the metaphor of acting as a shepherd to the flock of Christ.

If it should be alleged in this case, as it has been in some others, that the powers, apparently ascribed to presbyters, were really intended to be exercised by bishops, here included under the generic name of elders, we reply, that such a mode of reasoning precludes the possibility of proving anything, except so far as the opposing party may think proper to allow it. If the ascription of a certain power to a certain class of officers, distinctly named, is not a proof of their possessing it, the fact is not susceptible of proof at all. And this extraordinary process, let it be observed, is equally available on either side of a disputed question. If one man may explain away the acts ascribed to presbyters as the exclusive acts of bishops, then another may explain away the acts ascribed to deacons as the exclusive acts of presbyters, and those ascribed to men as the exclusive acts of angels. It should also be observed, that if one of the official acts ascribed to presbyters may be explained away as the exclusive act of a superior order, any other of the acts so ascribed may be explained in the same manner. If, when presbyters are spoken of as exercising all the ministerial powers, one may argue that bishops are the only elders who are thus empowered to ordain, another may, with equal right, allege that bishops are the only elders authorized to preach or to baptize, and that the primitive presbyters did neither, by themselves or in their own right, but merely united, as assessors, in the preaching and baptizing acts of their superiors in office. To an argument which naturally leads to such results, it is sufficient to oppose a simple negative, by saying that as bishops or apostles are not mentioned in the text, the official acts ascribed to presbyters were meant to be considered as performed by them alone in that capacity. When therefore Paul describes the presbyters of Ephesus as having been divinely called to act as shepherds of God's flock, we must regard it as a proof that all the powers of the ministry, including those of discipline and ordination, were possessed and exercised by elders, even in the days of the apostles.

A large part of what has now been said applies, with equal force, to 1 Tim. v. 17, where the same apostle speaks, on a different occasion, not only of the same office, but of the same

men, not only of elders in general, but of Ephesian elders in particular. Supposing, as we have before done, that *πρεσβύτεροι* is here a name of office, it cannot be descriptive of the office of apostle or apostle-bishop, partly for the reason above given in another case, that the assumption is entirely gratuitous, partly because Timothy, according to the adverse theory, would then be represented as a hyper-apostolical church-officer, not only equal but superior to Paul, who was merely an apostle. If, on the other hand, the word denotes presbyters or elders, in the proper sense, then the apostle must be speaking of the powers which belonged to them in that capacity, and not as the mere agents of a higher power. That no superiority of Timothy to these Ephesian elders is implied in the apostle's words, has been often shown, and will be here assumed. Since then, it is of elders that he speaks, and of elders acting in their own right, we have only to inquire what official functions are ascribed to them, in order to determine what the powers of a presbyter or elder were, in apostolic times. "Let the ELDERS THAT RULE well be counted worthy of double honour." They are here distinctly recognised as rulers in the church, and this must surely comprehend the right of discipline, if not of ordination. It may be said, however, that *προεστῶτες* merely means presiding, holding the first place in the society, and therefore denotes relative position, but not office or official power. We have assumed, however, that *πρεσβύτεροι* denotes official rank; and whether *προεστῶτες* does not signify the exercise of an official power, is a question which can only be determined by a reference to usage. In Rom. xii. 8, ὁ προϊστάμενος cannot denote mere priority of rank or conspicuous position, for two reasons: first, because a man could not be exhorted to hold such a position with diligence; and secondly, because all the other terms connected with it signify specific actions. The same thing is evident from the collocation of *προϊστάμενους* in 1 Thess. v. 12, between *κοπιῶντας* and *νουθετοῦντας*, both denoting specific functions of the ministry. In 1 Tim. iii. 5, the bishop is described as one that ruleth well (*καλῶς προϊστάμενον*) his own house, which can hardly mean one who holds the first place in it, without any original jurisdiction over it. Let the sense which *προΐστημι* evidently has in all these cases, be applied to that before us, and it follows of course, that presbyters or bishops are here spoken of as ruling the church, just as really as they are

elsewhere said to rule their families. That the government referred to is that of the church, appears from what follows in the same verse, as to labouring in word and doctrine. If, then, *πρεσβύτεροι* is here a name of office, which must be allowed by those, at least, who use this text to prove Timothy's superiority to presbyters, then the officers described by it are clearly recognised as rulers in the church, without any reference whatever to a superior human power. Where shall we find an equally distinct ascription of the ruling power to apostles, not of the original thirteen?

Here then are two passages, in which the same apostle speaks of the Ephesian elders, first metaphorically as the shepherds of Christ's flock, then literally as the rulers of the church. Whatever doubt might be supposed to rest upon the meaning of the terms employed, in either case, may be disposed of by comparing them together. That *ποιμαίνειν* does not merely denote *feeding*, whether literal or spiritual, but the whole extent of the pastoral care, including government, may now be argued from the *προεστῶτες* of the parallel passage. And that *προεστῶτες*, on the other hand, includes the powers of discipline and ordination, is rendered still more probable by Paul's exhorting these same elders, in the other case, to duties which imply the possession of these powers. The two texts, taken in conjunction, so as to explain each other, warrant us in stating as a general fact, that the Ephesian elders are twice spoken of by Paul as rulers of the church, without any intimation that the power of ordination is to be excepted, or that they acted in subjection to a bishop. Now the terms of this description must be applicable, either to presbyters in general, or to the presbyters of Ephesus exclusively. The latter supposition would imply, that there was no uniformity in primitive church-government, the same class of officers possessing different powers in different cases, a hypothesis destructive of all arguments against presbyterian orders, founded on alleged deviations from the apostolic model.

We have moreover a direct proof that this organization was a general one in the first epistle of Peter, where he addresses the elders, not of one church merely, but of Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia; calls himself their fellow-elder, and exhorts them to "feed the flock of God"—the same expression used by Paul to the Ephesian elders—"taking the



oversight thereof, not by constraint but willingly, not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being lords over God's heritage,"—this implies that they were under a temptation so to do, which could scarcely be the case, if they were mere assessors to a bishop—"and when the chief shepherd shall appear"—this clearly implies that they were under-shepherds only to the head of the church—"ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away." If it can be supposed that all the churches of Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, were accidentally deprived of bishops at this time, it would go far to prove that the privation was a matter of but little moment. If, however, this description has respect to presbyters in general, we have proof that the primitive presbyters were rulers of the church, and no proof that discipline and ordination were excepted from their powers.

With the general view, which we have thus obtained from scripture, of the presbyterial office as a whole, let us now compare the more specific language of the same apostle in the same epistle, when he says to Timothy, "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery." (1 Tim. iv. 14.) If this does not relate to ordination, there can be no reason for supposing that the parallel passage in 2 Tim. i. 6, relates to ordination; and as the transaction recorded in Acts xiii. 1—3 was nothing more than a solemn designation to a special service, the result is, that we have in the New Testament no proof that any rite of ordination was considered necessary, nor any instance of its having been performed, the word sometimes rendered by the English verb *ordain* being a general expression for the act of constituting or appointing. So far, then, from the act of ordination, as distinct from that of designation or appointment, being formally reserved, as the peculiar prerogative of a superior order in the ministry, it would not seem to have been used at all, and the general terms in which the presbyters are spoken of, as rulers of the church, are to be understood as comprehending all the powers necessary to its maintenance and government. But even granting that the text relates to ordination in the proper sense, it has been alleged that the ordaining act is not ascribed to presbyters, as such, but to apostles.

In support of this assertion, very different positions have been taken. In the first place it has been alleged, that the presbytery may have consisted wholly of apostles. Not to reiterate the reasons which have been already given, for resisting all gratuitous assumptions, tending to reverse the natural import of language, and to render proof impossible, we answer this objection by a counter allegation, that the presbytery may have consisted wholly of mere presbyters. The two possibilities will balance one another, and in choosing between them, the word *πρεσβυτερίον* must have due weight. It is certainly more likely, in the absence of explicit proof, that *πρεσβυτερίον*, if it means a body of men at all, means a body of mere presbyters, than that it means a body of apostles. The apostles, being presbyters, might be included in the name; but as they had a distinctive title of their own, it is natural to suppose, that if their distinctive functions were the subject of discourse, their distinctive title would be used, and, on the other hand, that when the generic title is employed, the functions spoken of are not the peculiar functions of apostles, as apostles, but those which are common to them and presbyters. Or even if *πρεσβυτερίον* here denotes apostles, the use of the name in this connexion shows that it was in the character of presbyters that they ordained. It seems incredible, that if they held two offices, a higher and a lower, those acts which they performed by virtue of the former, should be connected with the title of the latter. The bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church are, in some cases, rectors of particular parishes. When we read therefore, of a man as rector of a certain church, we may be reading of a bishop; but no one acquainted with the true facts of the case would speak of a bishop by the other title, when ascribing to him acts which, according to the customs of that church, could only be performed by him as bishop. No clergyman of New Jersey, it may be presumed, would speak of having been ordained by the rector of St. Mary's, Burlington. On the other hand, the official record of a baptism, as having been administered by the rector of that church, would be regarded as conclusive evidence that parochial clergymen have power to baptize; nor would it be invalidated by the allegation, that as the rector in question was a bishop, it was in the latter character alone that he baptized; much less by the suggestion that he

*may* have been a bishop, and that ordinary rector therefore had no such authority. If, then, the apostles are here mentioned as ordainers, and as forming a *πρεσβυτέριον* for the purpose, it must have been in the character of presbyters that they ordained. Supposing, then, that *πρεσβυτέριον* means a body of men, it matters not of whom it was composed; for, whatever else they may have been, they must have been presbyters, and as such they ordained.

To escape from this dilemma, it has been alleged, that *πρεσβυτέριον* denotes, not the ordainers, but the office of a presbyter. To this there are two very serious objections. In the first place, the construction is unusual and unnatural, the laying on of the hands of an office. According to all usage and analogy, the genitive, after *χειρῶν* must denote the persons, to whom the hands belonged, and by whom the imposition was performed. Can it be fortuitous, that, out of more than a hundred other cases, in which some form of *χείρ* is followed in construction by the genitive, there is not one in which it can be supposed to signify any thing, except the person whose hands are mentioned? Or can it be supposed, that the relation of τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου to *χειρῶν*, in the case before us, is different from that of μου to the same word, in the precisely parallel expression, 2 Tim. i. 6? The other objection to this interpretation of the word is, that in the only other places where it occurs in the New Testament, it means, and can mean, nothing but a body of *πρεσβύτεροι*.\* Before we can explain it of the office, therefore, we must adopt, first, an unnatural and unparallelled construction, and then, an unauthorized meaning of the principal word. That is to say, it cannot be so explained, without doing violence both to lexicography and grammar.

But there is still another method of evading the conclusion, that presbyters are here represented as ordaining. This is by asserting, that even if *πρεσβυτέριον* does mean a body of elders, *μετά* does not mean *by* but *with*, denoting mere participation, not authoritative action, so that presbyters are not represented as ordaining, but merely as joining in the ordination. This view of the passage takes for granted, first, that the preposition cannot mean *by*, but must mean *with*; and then, that if it does mean *with*, it must connect the action of the presbyters, as mere

\* Luke xxii. 66. Acts xxii. 5.

assessors, with the authoritative act of the apostles, as ordainers. Both these assumptions are entirely unauthorized. The Greek *μετὰ*, like the English *with*, has sometimes the secondary sense of *by, by means of*. The origin of this secondary meaning seems to be, that the agent acts *with* his instrument, in the strict sense, i. e. in company with it; and thus the preposition, which strictly conveys this idea only, conveys by implication that of instrumentality. The transition from the one sense to the other may be seen in such expressions as the following. 'Pursue him with the sword, and then destroy him with the sword.' In the first phrase, *with* denotes merely that the sword is to accompany the pursuers; in the second it denotes, that the sword is the instrument, by which they are to act. This etymological analysis is confirmed by the usage of the New Testament. "Thou shalt make me full of joy with (*μετὰ*) thy countenance." (Acts ii. 28.) This cannot mean 'thou, together with thy countenance, shalt make me full of joy'—nor, 'thou shalt make me, together with thy countenance, full of joy'—but 'thou, by means of thy countenance (or presence), shalt make me full of joy.' The same thing, in substance, may be said of Acts xiii. 17: "and *with* an high arm brought he them out of it." In Acts xiv. 27 we read, that when Paul and Barnabas returned to Antioch, "they gathered the church together and rehearsed all that God had done with them (*μετ' αὐτῶν*)," and again, Acts xv. 4, "they declared all things that God had done with them." This does not mean "to them," as it might possibly in English, because *μετὰ* is not used elsewhere in that sense, and because the context shows that the historian means what God had done to the Gentiles *by them* or *through* them, as his instruments. These examples will suffice to show, that *μετὰ* may mean *by*, as well as *with*, and that it is not, therefore, to be taken for granted, that it here expresses a different kind of action. Granting, however, that it does mean *with*, in the strict sense, what two things does it connect? The imposition of hands with what? The adverse argument assumes, not only that it may, but that it must, connect the imposition of hands by the presbytery with the ordaining act of the apostle, which is not mentioned at all. Now if any rule of construction can be looked upon as fixed, it is that what is expressed, other things being equal, must be preferred to what is not expressed, but



merely conjectured or supposed. According to this principle, *μετὰ*, if it merely means *together with*, must connect the imposition of the hands of the presbytery with the prophecy or revelation, mentioned just before. How was the gift conferred on Timothy? By means of a divine communication, *διὰ προφητείας*. By that alone? No, but by revelation, *together with* the laying on of hands, which is essentially equivalent to saying, 'by revelation *and* the imposition of hands.' Whatever force the *διὰ* has in relation to *προφητείας* it has in relation to *ἐπιθέσεως*, the *μετὰ* serving merely to connect them.

We are then reduced to this alternative. If *μετὰ* is a mere connective, it connects *προφητείας* with *ἐπιθέσεως*, and implies that the ordination was as much effected by the one as by the other, or that both were alike instruments or channels of communication, by which the gift of God was conveyed to Timothy. But if *μετὰ* is more than a connective, and itself denotes *by means of*, then the act of the presbytery is itself described, as the medium or instrument of ordination. On the whole, then, it appears, that unless we give to *πρεσβυτέριον* a meaning which it has not elsewhere, and connect it with the words before it in a manner which is utterly at variance with the usage of the language, or assume, without necessity or right, that it here denotes a body of apostles, or that the action of apostles, although not expressed, is understood, and that of the presbytery made dependent on it, we are under the necessity of drawing the conclusion, that presbyters, in apostolic times, ordained. And this, which is the only exposition of the text that harmonizes fully with the usage of the words and with the principles of grammar, that supposes nothing and imagines nothing, but allows the text to speak for itself, is moreover recommended by its perfect agreement with the natural and obvious meaning of the passages before considered, in which presbyters are spoken of as bearing the whole burden of church government, and called to duties which imply the power not only of discipline but of ordination.

But although these passages contain enough to warrant the conclusion, that the primitive presbyters possessed and exercised the highest powers now belonging to the ministry, it cannot be denied, that this conclusion would be rendered more completely satisfying, if it were possible to cite a case, in which there could be no dispute or doubt, in relation either to the acts described,

or to the persons represented as performing them, on both which points there is some room for diversity of judgment in the cases just considered, though the balance of probabilities appears to us decidedly in favour of the ground which we defend. But this preponderance would be the more decided and conspicuous, from the collateral evidence afforded even by a single case, in which all parties could agree that certain persons are described as exercising certain powers. Now the fact is, that we have it in our power to adduce not only one case of the kind supposed, but two, which we shall now proceed to state.

It is granted, upon all sides, that Timothy in Ephesus, and Titus in Crete, possessed and exercised the highest powers now belonging to the ministry. So fully is this fact admitted by our adversaries, that they build upon it their most specious argument, to prove that the apostolic office is perpetual. Our objections to that argument have been already stated; but the fact upon which it is founded, we agree with our opponents in asserting. We maintain, with them, that there are no ministerial functions now existing in the church, which were not exercised by Timothy and Titus, who are clearly recognised as having power not only to preach and administer the sacraments but to ordain and govern. It is, however, a matter of some moment to observe the nature of the evidence, which forms the ground of this unanimous conclusion. The point at which we differ is the question whether the possession of these powers necessarily supposes a superiority of permanent official rank in Timothy and Titus above presbyters. Our reasons for believing that it does not, have already been detailed, and what we now design is merely to direct attention to the nature of the evidence, by which the opposite opinion is sustained, and which is certainly not destitute of plausibility. The argument may be succinctly stated thus, that since the right of ordination and of ministerial discipline is recognised by Paul, in his epistles to these two men, as belonging to them, they must of necessity have been superior to the presbyters whom they were to ordain and discipline.

This conclusion is vitiated by the false assumption, upon which it rests, that ordination to an office in the church can only be derived from one who holds a higher office, and that ministers of equal rank cannot mutually discipline each other. But

for this defect, the reasoning would be conclusive. They are clearly commanded to ordain and exercise authority, and this, if inconsistent with equality of rank and identity of office, would demonstrate their superiority to presbyters. It will not, however, be contended, even by the warmest advocates of this opinion, that the evidence of this superiority, contained in Paul's epistles, is the strongest that can be imagined. They will grant, not only that a formal categorical assertion of the fact disputed would be stronger proof than that which is derived by inference from Paul's instructions, but that even in default of such assertion, the contested point might possibly have been much more indisputable than it is. If, for example, it had been recorded, as a historical fact, that Timothy and Titus acted towards the presbyters of Ephesus and Crete as their official inferiors, directing all their movements, and controlling the discharge of their official duties by minute instructions, our opponents would no doubt regard the proof of their superiority as stronger than it now is. And the evidence would surely be regarded as still more decisive, if among the books of the New Testament there were epistles written by Timothy and Titus to the presbyters of Ephesus and Crete; containing no recognition of equality beyond what is habitually used by modern bishops to their youngest clergy; directing the movements of the elders in a positive and peremptory manner, without any reference to their own inclination or opinion; the superior rank of the two writers would be looked upon as quite indisputable. But if, in addition to all this, the elders were required to exercise their highest powers as the representatives or delegates of Timothy and Titus, with directions to pursue a certain course, until the writers should be personally present, and with kind but authoritative hints as to the personal improvement of the presbyters addressed, it must be owned that the denial of superior official rank in Timothy and Titus would be hopeless. Now it happens, unfortunately for the adverse argument, that no such evidence exists, in reference to Timothy and Titus, whose superiority to presbyters must stand or fall with the assumption, that the power of ordination and of discipline implies a permanent diversity of rank. But what we wish especially to bring before the reader is the interesting fact, that the very evidence, which

would be universally acknowledged, as sufficient to establish the superiority of Timothy and Titus, with respect to presbyters, does certainly exist, in the case of Paul, with respect to Timothy and Titus themselves. The facts, which constitute this evidence, have been already stated in detail, but in different connexions. That their bearing on the question now before us may be seen, a brief recapitulation will be necessary, under several particulars.

And first, let it be observed, that in the other books of the New Testament, that is to say, exclusive of the three epistles to Timothy and Titus, they are mentioned in a manner, which not only furnishes no proof of their equality to Paul, but naturally leads to the conclusion of their being his inferiors, in rank and office. In the Acts of the Apostles, it will not be disputed, that Timothy appears as Paul's inferior, a young man chosen to attend him in his missionary travels, as a helper and a confidential messenger. It may be said, indeed, that it would not be fair to argue, from the first stage of Timothy's career, that he was always Paul's inferior; and this is true. But if we find Paul subsequently speaking of and to him, in a tone precisely suited to this original relation of the parties, it will surely make it highly probable, to say the least, that this relation still continued to subsist. And that this is really the case will be perceived upon comparing the place occupied by Timothy, as Paul's *διάκονος* or *ὑπηρέτης*, in the Acts of the Apostles, with the way in which Paul speaks to the Corinthians of having sent Timotheus to them and requests that he may be among them without fear, and that no man may despise him, and that he may be sent back to the Apostle in due time (1 Cor. xvi. 10, 11.) It is plain from these words, not only that Timothy was acting as Paul's messenger, and under his direction, but also that the service was a temporary one, and that when it was accomplished, he was to return to his accustomed duties, as the apostle's personal attendant. And that this was not a solitary case of such employment, is apparent from the first epistle to the Thessalonians, where Paul speaks first of having sent Timotheus to them (ch. iii. 2,) and then of his return and of the news which he brought back (v. 6,) to which may be added Phil. ii. 19, where he intimates his purpose to send Timotheus to them, not to remain there, but to bring him an account of their condition. In this last case, the execution of the purpose is left dependent upon



Paul's own movements and convenience (v. 23), with an intimation that the sending of Timothy was merely meant to be a substitute for the apostle's personal attendance (v. 24.) The relation between Timothy and Paul, apparent in these passages, may be compared to that between an aid-de-camp and his commander, the two main duties, in both cases, being those of personal attendance and of active service in communicating orders. That the relative position of Titus was the same, may be inferred from Paul's allusions to "the coming of Titus," as of one who had been absent upon special duty, to the report which he had made of the state of things at Corinth, and to the effect produced upon him by his visit to the church there. (2 Cor. vii. 6, 7, 13, 15.) It may also be observed that the Apostle speaks of the obedience and respect with which the Corinthians had treated Titus, as a mark of their submission to his own apostolical authority (vs. 15, 16.) Another incidental reference to Paul's employing Titus in this manner may be found in 2 Tim. iv. 10, where he is mentioned among Paul's immediate followers. "Demas has forsaken me, having loved this present world, and is departed unto Thessalonica; Crescens to Galatia; Titus to Dalmatia; only Luke is with me; take Mark and bring him with thee; for he is profitable for me *εἰς διακονίαν*," not "for the ministry" in general, but as a *διάκονος* or personal assistant in my labours. It seems plain that all the persons here named bore the same relation to the apostle, and were equally under his authority. Although Titus, therefore, is not mentioned in the Acts, there can be no doubt that his course began, like Timothy's, in personal attendance upon Paul in his journeys, to which indeed we find express allusion in Gal. ii. 1, 3, where his Greek descent and circumcision are referred to, and the fact recorded of his having gone with Paul and Barnabas, on a particular occasion, to Jerusalem.

Both from the history and the epistles, therefore, independently of those addressed to Timothy and Titus, it would naturally be inferred, that these men were inferior to Paul, and acted under his direction. It may, indeed, be said, that they are clearly recognised as ministers, that Timothy is mentioned as Paul's work-fellow (Rom. xvi. 21), "one that worketh the work of the Lord even as I do" (2 Cor. iv. 17,) as a "brother" (2 Cor. i. 1), who had "served" with Paul "in the gospel" (Phil. ii. 19;) that

Titus likewise is described as his "brother" (2 Cor. ii. 13), his "partner and fellow-labourer" with respect to the Corinthians (2 Cor. viii. 23.) All this is very true, and proves conclusively that Timothy and Titus were duly ordained ministers, and as such held the rank of presbyters or elders. But this, so far from proving their equality to Paul, strengthens the proof of their inferiority, by bringing their acknowledged ministerial standing into contrast with the manifest assumption of superiority on Paul's part. His continuing to regulate their movements after their admission to the ministry, shows clearly that he was superior, not only as a minister to private Christians, but as an apostle to mere presbyters or elders.

If it should be alleged, however, that Timothy and Titus were themselves invested with this same superiority, and that it is in this capacity that Paul addresses them, this is a question which can only be determined by an examination of the three epistles. If it be true that Paul's superiority to Timothy and Titus ceased before the date of his epistles to them, we may certainly expect to find the tone of his address to them materially altered, and the habit of express command exchanged for that of brotherly suggestion. And we find indeed many strong expressions of fraternal, or rather of paternal love, but mingled with peremptory and direct commands, as well as incidental intimations of superior authority, upon the writer's part, some of which might be considered dubious or of little moment, if we did not know the mutual relation of the parties at an earlier date. The hypothesis that Timothy had now attained equality of rank with Paul, though not contradicted, is certainly not favoured by those parts of these epistles, in which Paul speaks of having left him at Ephesus for a special purpose (1 Tim. i. 3) and renews the commission under which he acted (v. 18); gives him particular directions for his conduct until he shall come (ch. iii. 14, 15: iv. 13, 14), and summons Timothy to come within a certain time (2 Tim. iv. 21) and take the place of those who had just left him (ch. iv. 9—12,) bringing Paul's cloak and parchments with him (v. 13.)

Titus also is described as being left in Crete by Paul, to finish that which he had left undone (Tit. i. 5), and is required to rejoin him, when relieved by Artemas or Tychicus (Tit. iii. 12.) All this goes to prove that no such change had taken place in

the relations of these men to Paul as would make them no longer his inferiors in office. And the same thing, though it could not be directly proved, is certainly corroborated by the numerous advices which he gives them with a view to their personal improvement, as when he exhorts Timothy to hold faith and a good conscience (1 Tim. i. 19), to refuse profane and old wives' fables and exercise himself unto godliness (1 Tim. iv. 7), to give attendance to reading, exhortation and doctrine (v. 13,) to let his proficiency appear to all (v. 15), to take heed to himself and to the doctrine that he may be saved (v. 16), to avoid covetousness and follow after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness (ch. vi. 11), to fight the good fight of faith and lay hold on eternal life (v. 12), to keep Paul's commandment without spot, unrebukeable, until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ (v. 14,) to avoid profane and vain babblings and oppositions of science falsely so called (1 Tim. vi. 20; 2 Tim. ii. 16), to be strong in the grace that is in Christ Jesus (2 Tim. ii. 1), to endure hardness as a good soldier of Jesus Christ (v. 3), to avoid foolish and unlearned questions (v. 23,) to flee youthful lusts and follow righteousness, faith, charity, and peace (v. 22,) to continue in the things which he had learned of Paul (2 Tim. iii. 14,) and to endure afflictions (2 Tim. iv. 5.)

It may be said, that all these are expressions, which might naturally be used by a man of Paul's celebrity and standing in the church, even to those holding the same office, if much younger than himself, and still more if they were his spiritual children. Admitting this to be a sufficient explanation of the general tone of Paul's epistles, and of his exhortations to mere personal and private duties, will it answer the same purpose, with respect to his authoritative directions for the discharge of their official duties? Can it be supposed that such minute instructions, as to public worship, ordination, discipline, the duties to be enjoined upon different classes of society, as are contained in these epistles, would have been given to any but inferiors in rank and office? Such a hypothesis might be admissible, if every thing else in the epistles favoured it; but not when their whole drift and tenor make it scarcely possible to doubt that Timothy and Titus are addressed as Paul's inferiors. There are several classes of objections to the opposite opinion, every one of which would seem decisive unless countervailed by other circumstances. The general tone of the epistles is almost enough

to show that Paul was their superior in office. It would fail to do so, if there were express recognitions of equality; but there are none. His dictation to them, with respect to the discharge of their official functions, would be almost enough to prove the point. Above all, the distinct allusions to their acting merely as Paul's messengers and delegates, without renouncing their relation to him as his personal attendants, make it almost certain. Now as each of these distinctive features of the three epistles is almost sufficient of itself to prove what we allege, and as none of them detracts from any of the others, but confirms them, we may safely state as the most probable conclusion from the data generally, that the men, to whom these three epistles were addressed, were no less subject to Paul's authority, and consequently no less inferior in official rank, when labouring at Ephesus and Crete, than when attending him in Greece or Asia Minor or Judea.

If any should still think, however, that the supposition of their inferiority is not necessary to explain the tone and contents of these epistles, let them look at the question in another point of view. Let them suppose, though merely for the sake of argument, that these men were not only younger than Paul, and his spiritual children, but inferiors in office, and that Paul, in writing to them, had this inferiority in view, and was influenced by it, both in matter and in manner. How could he, without saying *totidem verbis*, you are my inferiors, have more distinctly conveyed that idea, than he has done here? What form of address, what selection of topics, what turn of expression, what peculiar tone, what allusions to his own superiority and their subjection to him, could have made the matter clearer than it is? If an air of paternal condescension, if repeated exhortations to fidelity, if positive commands as to official acts, if peremptory orders, as to times and places, and express injunctions to return to personal attendance on the writer, do not prove inferiority of rank in those who are addressed, it must be because no proof of the fact is possible, except by formal categorical assertion. If, however, it be true, that Paul addresses these two men precisely as he must have done if they were his inferiors in office, we believe a vast majority of readers will think this a decisive proof that they were so. Nor can it be rejected, with-



out flagrant inconsistency, by those who plead for a perpetual apostleship. The proof of that opinion rests, almost exclusively, upon the fact, that Timothy and Titus are directed to ordain and discipline presbyters, from which it is inferred that they were more themselves. But if their being thus directed can prove their superiority to elders, how much more does Paul's directing them prove his superiority to them. Those very powers, the imputed exercise of which is made a proof that they were more than presbyters, were exercised at Paul's command, and in conformity with his minute instructions. The least that can be argued from this fact is that Paul's superiority to Timothy and Titus is as clearly proved as theirs to presbyters. But this is only a small part of the whole truth; for while the proof of their superiority to presbyters is wholly insufficient, that of Paul's superiority to them is perfect. The former, as we have before seen, rests upon the false assumption that a presbyter could neither be ordained nor disciplined by those of the same order. But the fact of Paul's superiority to Timothy and Titus does not rest upon his having ordained them or acted as their judge; but upon his actual control of their official functions, and their actual subjection to his apostolical authority. The very fact of their ordaining and exercising discipline at all may be described as doubtful, in comparison with that of Paul's governing themselves. That they governed and ordained, is a mere inference from Paul's advising them how they should exercise these powers. But that they themselves were ruled by Paul, is no such inference. The act itself is upon record in these three epistles, which are nothing more nor less than three solemn acts of apostolical authority.

The fact, then, that Timothy and Titus were inferior to Paul, in rank and office, is not only upon all common principles of reasoning, but even upon those which are peculiar to the adverse party, fully established. But if they were inferior to Paul in office, they must either have been presbyters, or something intermediate between that and apostles. The assumption of an intermediate order sweeps away, of course, all arguments to prove that certain persons were apostles, simply because they were superior to presbyters. It also gives a license to assume as many intermediate orders as may be required to

demonstrate different hypotheses. In point of fact, however, it has never been assumed. It is one of the conceded points, on which the parties to this controversy meet, that there was no office in the primitive church system, above that of presbyter, excepting the apostleship. If, then, Timothy and Titus were inferior to Paul, they could not have been more than presbyters, and must in that capacity have exercised the right of ordination and of discipline. If, as a last resort, it be alleged, that these powers were exercised by virtue of a special commission, and not as ordinary functions of the eldership, it still remains true, even granting this assertion, that presbyters were competent to exercise these powers, without being elevated to a higher office. What they were thus occasionally authorized to do by the original apostles, they might still do, even if there were apostles in the church; but if, as we have seen already, there are none, then what was occasionally done by presbyters at first, must now be done habitually by them, as the highest class of officers existing, by divine right, in the church. Much more must they possess this right as the successors of the primitive elders, if the latter, as we have the strongest reason to believe, possessed it, not occasionally merely, but as a necessary function of their office.

The result of our inquiry may be briefly stated thus; that Paul addresses the presbyters of Ephesus, as if the whole care of the church was to devolve on them, representing them as shepherds of Christ's flock, a metaphor implying the possession of the highest powers and employed here in its widest sense, because connected with the prediction of dangers which could only be averted by the exercise of great authority, and also because Peter, in addressing the presbyters of Asia Minor, speaks of them as shepherds, subject to no chief shepherd but the Lord Jesus Christ, and possessing powers which might easily become despotic in their exercise. We find too that Paul elsewhere speaks of the presbyters of Ephesus as "ruling," the word employed being the same used to denote the government of families, and therefore in its application to the church, implying the possession of the highest powers, not excepting those of discipline and ordination. And accordingly we find the ordination of Timothy ascribed to

a presbytery, which, on any natural interpretation of the term, can only mean a body of presbyters acting in that character. We find too that Timothy and Titus, while actually exercising the highest powers now belonging to the ministry, are distinctly recognised as Paul's inferiors in rank and office, and therefore as something less than apostles, and nothing more than presbyters, whether acting in the ordinary course of duty, or by virtue of a special commission.

From these special testimonies, singly and together, we infer that presbyters, in apostolic times, possessed and exercised the highest powers now belonging to the ministry. And having thus established our position by direct proof, we may briefly advert to certain passages and detached expressions, which although they may prove nothing by themselves, and are susceptible of different explanations, and have therefore not been used by us in argument, may nevertheless serve as incidental confirmations of the truth which has already been established. Of these the first which we shall mention is the account of the council at Jerusalem, to which the church of Antioch referred an interesting and important question, sending Paul and Barnabas and others to Jerusalem, "unto the apostles AND ELDERS, about this question." (Acts xv. 2.) "And when they were come to Jerusalem, they were received of the apostles AND ELDERS." (v. 4). "And the apostles AND ELDERS came together, for to consider of the matter," (v. 6), and after due deliberation and discussion, "it pleased the apostles AND ELDERS (v. 22) to send a letter to the church at Antioch, with this inscription, "The apostles AND ELDERS and brethren send greeting," &c., (v. 23), and we afterwards read that Paul and Silas, in their missionary tour through Asia Minor, "as they went through the cities, delivered unto them the decrees for to keep, that were ordained of the apostles AND ELDERS which were at Jerusalem." (Acts xvi. 4). All that we now mean to infer from this transaction is that, even while the most of the apostles were still present at Jerusalem, the church there had elders, and that these were not regarded as mere teachers, or leaders in public worship, but as men clothed with authority.

If any should object that the same reasoning would prove the ordinary members of the church to have possessed the same

authority, because it was "the church" that received the messengers from Antioch, (Acts xv. 4), because it was "the apostles and elders WITH THE WHOLE CHURCH" that decided the question (v. 22), and because the epistle was written in the name of "the apostles and elders AND BRETHREN," (v. 23), we answer, first, that though the brethren, or church at large, are mentioned in these cases, they are not in the others which have been already quoted, whereas the elders are invariably named whenever the apostles are; secondly, that, according to the principles of government laid down both in the Old and the New Testament, the church could only act through the apostles and the elders, and especially the latter, who were really the representatives of the church at Jerusalem, so that it does not even certainly appear, that the church-members were in any sense present except in the person of their representatives; the word translated "multitude" in v. 12 being indefinite and relative in meaning; lastly, that we are citing this case only in corroboration of the fact, already proved from other quarters, that the presbyters were rulers, whereas no such proof exists of the powers of government having been exercised by the people generally.

That this constitution of the mother church was copied into others, as they were organized, is plain from the practice of Paul and Barnabas, who, as they passed through Asia Minor, "ordained them elders in every church," (Acts xiv. 23), and from Paul's leaving Titus in Crete to "ordain elders in every city." (Tit. i. 5). The powers of these elders were no doubt the same as in the mother church, and though they are not often mentioned, it is always in a manner to confirm the supposition that they were familiarly regarded as the highest local rulers of the church; as when James says, "Is any sick among you? let him call for the elders of the church," (Jas. v. 14), and Peter tells the presbyters of Asia Minor, that he is "also an elder," (1 Pet. v. 1), and John calls himself, in the inscriptions of his two epistles, ὁ πρεσβύτερος. That in the last case it denotes the senior apostle, and that in the others it is a generic title for church-officers in general, is no doubt possible; and all that is intended is to point out how completely even the incidental notices of presbyters agree with the hypothesis which we have been defending.



It may be a matter of surprise and even of objection, on the part of some, that so few positive testimonies to the truth of that hypothesis are found in scripture. But let such remember that church-government is very seldom spoken of at all, and ordination scarcely ever, so that in proportion to the space allotted to the general subject, the foregoing proofs may be considered ample. One effect of the comparative neglect of all such matters by the sacred writers, is that something, upon any supposition, is to be supplied by inference or analogy. The only question is, which hypothesis requires least to be conjectured or assumed? As this would be no unfair criterion of truth, we are willing to submit our doctrine to a rigorous comparison, in this respect, with that of our opponents. They admit that the presbyterial office was established in the primitive church and was intended to be permanent, that it was clothed with the important powers of preaching the gospel and administering the sacraments, and that it is repeatedly spoken of in terms which, taken by themselves, would imply the possession of the highest powers now belonging to the ministry. But this conclusion they avoid by assuming that although this office was intended to continue, and entrusted with some functions of the greatest moment, it was not empowered to ordain or exercise supreme authority, that these prerogatives were specially reserved to a superior order. This, however, cannot be maintained without supposing, that on various occasions when the mention of this higher class would seem to have been almost unavoidable, the sacred writers did nevertheless pass it by in silence, and not only pass it by, but apply the very language, which would best describe its powers, to the lower order which had no such powers. However this extraordinary fact may be accounted for, it must be assumed, or the adverse doctrine cannot be maintained. Our own hypothesis, on the contrary, takes words and phrases in their usual sense and their most natural construction, and adds nothing to the facts which are admitted by both parties, but setting out from the conceded fact that presbyters were officers of high rank and entrusted with important powers, it concludes that when they are referred to as the highest local rulers of the churches, they were so in fact; that when certain duties are enjoined upon them, it was meant that they should do them;

in a word, that the obvious and natural meaning of the passages which speak of elders, is the true one, and that no other need be sought by forced constructions or gratuitous assumptions. By the application of this safe and simple method of interpretation, we have reached the conclusion that presbyters, as presbyters, possessed and exercised the highest ministerial powers, including those of discipline and ordination, in the days of the apostles; that the same rights and powers belong to them at present; and that no ministrations can be charged with invalidity, because they are performed under authority derived from presbyters.

---

ART. VII.—*An Introduction to the New Testament, containing an examination of the most important questions relating to the authority, interpretation, and integrity of the canonical books, with reference to the latest inquiries.* By Samuel Davidson, LL.D. Volume I. The Four Gospels. London: Samuel Bagster & Sons. 1848. Svo. pp. 430.

IN our last number we gave a very imperfect outline of the history of opinion with respect to the Four Gospels. Had we been acquainted then with the elegant volume now before us, our labour might have been greatly abridged by reference and extracts, and we should certainly have withheld or qualified our closing statement, as to the total want of books in the English language, presenting a correct view of the German speculations without any undue deference to their authority or gratuitous adoption of their principles. The general fact as to this deficiency in English literature is stated by Dr. Davidson himself in still stronger terms than we employed, and with an expression of contempt for the "stereotype-minded," and for those who creep along in "the ruts of hereditary or prevailing opinion," which we think less suited to correct the evil than to raise an unjust prejudice against his own work, as neologizing in its tendency; whereas its chief characteristic is the rare combination of a thorough knowledge of the German writers, with a total freedom from that slavish submission to their dicta,

which so frequently accompanies this kind of learning, both in England and America. As the criticism of the gospels is awakening more and more attention, such a work as that before us will, in all probability, excite the curiosity of many readers, and we therefore think it best, without renewing the discussion of the subject, to describe, as briefly and as clearly as we can, what the author has attempted, and how far he has accomplished it.

The grand merit of the book is that which we have hinted at already, that it shows a thorough and familiar acquaintance with the latest literature of the subject, which, as we have said before, is almost exclusively German. The intrinsic value of a large part of this matter, and the impossibility of utterly excluding it from the English-reading public, makes it highly desirable that those who feel an interest in such inquiries should have access to them, not in a garbled or one-sided shape, but in a fair and ample statement. At the same time, it is equally important that this statement should be made by one who is not infected with the virus of neology, or ashamed or afraid to dissent from the conclusions of the most authoritative German writers. Even a bias towards the opposite extreme of sturdy common-sense and prepossession against specious novelties, may, for obvious reasons, be regarded as a salutary check, in the exposition of these new and strange views to the English reader.

Both these conditions seem to us to be answered in the work before us. The author's knowledge of the recent foreign writers is surprisingly extensive and exact, coming down, so far as we can judge, to the very latest dates, and reaching to the most minute particulars. Nor is it mere bibliographical learning. With a rare patience of attention and facility of acquisition, he has really mastered the contents of this voluminous and complicated literature, stating opinions and authorities, wherever we can follow him, with exemplary fairness and precision. We have no hesitation in affirming that a careful study of this volume is, beyond comparison, the best means known to us, by which an English reader can inform himself, with least expenditure of time and labour, as to the latest forms of speculation with respect to the Four Gospels.

On the other hand, the conservative prejudice or prepossession

sion, which we have represented as desirable in such a case, has influenced the author's mind throughout in a very high degree, it may be, higher than he is himself aware. We have repeatedly been pleased to note the old-fashioned good sense and simplicity with which he sweeps away a fine-spun web of ingenious fallacy, by answers which, however, satisfactory to us and to himself, would be regarded by the subjects of his criticism as nothing more nor less than proofs of his ungerman intellect. Even admitting that he sometimes actually goes too far in this direction, and relies too much upon the straight-forward plain sense of his readers—a quality which there is cause to fear is rapidly decreasing in these fanciful and transcendental times—the general tendency, of which these are occasional excesses, is not only a correct one in itself, and especially entitled to respect when found to co-exist with such familiar knowledge of the writings which have done more than all other causes to discredit and destroy it, but peculiarly safe and re-assuring in the case of one who undertakes the delicate and doubtful task of engrafting German discoveries on the good old stock of English sobriety and solid sense.

What we have now said of our author's anti-neological propensities must not be understood as wholly acquitting him of all undue concession to the new opinions. In some of his departures from the old views, he appears to us to be not only wrong, but inconsistent. Yet even in these cases there is no appearance of a puerile submission to authority, or a morbid love of innovation, but a simple error of judgment, such as might have been committed in any other case of choice between numerous and conflicting views. These exceptions are, moreover, for the most part, such as affect only questions of detail. They do not touch the author's general principles of criticism or his views of inspiration. With respect to these, he is, in spite of his expressed contempt for such, as "stereotype-minded" as we could desire.

There is, however, one intellectual deficiency in the performance which detracts not a little from the safeness and the wholesomeness of its influence, though not in the least from the author's *bona fides* or his personal soundness in the faith. Like almost every other writer who attempts to refute a great variety of errors in a limited space, he sometimes states objections and



difficulties, which he either fails or neglects to answer. It would indeed be almost miraculous if one man, even of the highest powers and the most extensive learning, should be able single-handed, to resist and vanquish the selected subtilties of many cultivated minds. The attempt to do so would be highly presumptuous, if deliberately made. It is not, however, in this light that it is usually viewed by those who undertake so hazardous a task. The concentrated venom of a hundred teeming and erratic minds excites no more apprehension than the sophistries of one, and the defender of the truth is scarcely conscious of fighting against odds. He is also apt to be misled, by having passed through the ordeal himself without a change of his belief, into the error of supposing that the fallacies which failed to hoodwink him will be equally unsuccessful in the case of his own readers. Hence he frequently contents himself with simply stating an objection or a cavil, either wholly without comment, or with a bare description of it as absurd, when perhaps to many readers these very slighted and derided sophisms are as so many drops of deadly venom or the barbs of poisoned arrows, which the wounded mind has neither strength nor skill enough to render harmless.

With this defect, to some extent, it may be, unavoidable in executing such a plan, the work before us is unquestionably chargeable. The author does sometimes leave unanswered what he ought to have refuted or suppressed. Nor can it here be urged in justification, that the false opinion would be known at any rate, because if he repeats it without any antidote, he merely helps to give it currency and multiply the chances of its doing mischief. It is not, however, in this particular form that the mistake in question shows itself most frequently in the work before us. It does not belong to the character or habits of our author's mind to leave the refutation of an error unattempted. But a good will is not all that is required, and the effort is not always as successful as its honesty deserves. In other words, the author's reasoning against the skeptical opinions which he states, is sometimes very unequal to the ingenuity and force with which they are propounded even by himself, but nearly in the words of their original authors.

This defect may arise in part from something in the author's turn of mind and intellectual habits; but we think it is suffi-

ciently accounted for by the peculiar nature of the work itself. It is clearly impossible for any man to muster and marshal such a host of contradictory and complicated theories as a compiler and reporter, and at the same time to exercise his own powers of reasoning and judgment on this mass of heterogeneous materials with complete success. Considering the difficulties of the case, we are far more disposed to wonder that he has been so successful than to complain that he has not been more so.

In reference to what has now been said, the question may arise, how far this imperfection makes the work unfit for circulation, or unsafe to use. To this we answer, that a work of so much erudition is not likely to be carefully perused by any except those who are especially addicted to such studies, and who have already some acquaintance with the subject. To such the volume furnishes a valuable storehouse of materials, which might else be inaccessible, presented almost always in the light most favourable to old and strict opinions, by an author whose own principles are sound, and whose occasional failures to refute what he rejects may only serve to call forth a completer refutation on the part of those who come to the perusal of his work with right dispositions and the necessary literary preparation. As the ablest teacher commonly learns something even from his less distinguished pupils, so the industry and learning of an author may assist readers, far inferior to himself, in the solution of some difficulties which he has, either inadvertently or unavoidably, left without an antidote.

Dr. Davidson's style is among the least of his merits, being often at the same time awkward and ambitious. This is especially apparent when he chooses to expatiate on a topic. The diffuseness, which we have observed in his lectures on Biblical Criticism, and which was no doubt owing, in some measure, to their primary design, has been here corrected by the superabundance of matter to be crowded in a narrow compass. The worst fault chargeable upon the English of this book is a kind of euphemistic circumlocution, to avoid the repetition of the same word, which becomes worse than ludicrous when it leads the author to speak of our Saviour as "that person" or as "that distinguished Being."

The mechanical execution of the work is in the finest English

style. A writer on biblical subjects could not well fall into better hands than those of Samuel Bagster. The typography is certainly most beautiful, and seems to us immaculate. We trust that these external advantages will multiply intelligent readers, not of this volume only, but of those which are to follow it, and of the new edition of the *Biblical Criticism* which we are encouraged to expect, to say nothing of the other works which Dr. Davidson seems called in Providence to write and publish, in the exercise of his vocation as the safest and most skilful introducer of exotic learning, disinfected of exotic infidelity, to English readers.

---

## QUARTERLY LIST OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

**Important Doctrines of the true Christian Religion explained, demonstrated, and vindicated from popular Errors. Including among others, The Lord's Second Advent; The Divine Character, Unity, Trinity and Person; The Assumption of Humanity and Putting forth, thereby, the power of Redemption; The Sacrifice of Jesus Christ, and Salvation by his blood; His Mediation and Atonement; The Justification of a Sinner; Harmony with the Doctrine of a Plurality of Worlds. Being a Series of Lectures delivered at the New Jerusalem church, in Cross Street, Hatton Garden, London. By the Rev. S. Noble. With an Introduction by George Bush. New York: John Allen. Svo. pp. 485.**

The above long title gives a clear idea of the nature of this work. It contains twenty-seven popular Lectures on important subjects. It is perhaps the best, and certainly the most accessible, authentic exposition of Swedenborgianism. That system must have a certain power about it as it has lived under a weight of confusion and absurdity which would have long since crushed any ordinary theory to death. It is however only for a very limited class of men that the system has any attraction, or who have any affinity for the system; amiable men, who can believe and disbelieve at will; whose convictions are subject to their wishes, and their wishes determined by their imagination. Men, to whom the conceivable is, for that reason alone, the real. Some gentleman of this class, enamoured with this theory, has been at the expense either of the republication of these Lec-

tures, or of a liberal gratuitous distribution of copies. His request that those who receive the book would submit its doctrines to an impartial examination, is a very large demand. It is surely not a very modest request that a man should throw away not only all his own most intimate convictions, but the faith of the whole church, and begin de novo. It is as though a teacher should require his pupil to unlearn all he knows, and to present his mind as a tabula rasa. We think it high time that Mr. Bush should turn to some other vocation than that of a seer. He has seen so many visions, which proved mere illusions, and been so thoroughly convinced one day of what he has no faith in the next, that it would become him to be less frequent in his apparitions under the character of a guide among the things unseen and eternal.

Superstition, its nature, its manifestations, its evils, and the remedy therefor. A Sermon preached in the Government Street church, Mobile, By W. T. Hamilton, D.D., Pastor of said Church. (Published by Request.) Mobile. 8vo.

Popery the Punishment of Unbelief. A Sermon delivered before the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, at Baltimore, May 26, 1848. By Alexander T. McGill, D.D., Professor in the Western Theological Seminary. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. 12mo.

The Rev. Leigh Richmond's Letters and Counsels to his children. Selected from his Memoirs and Domestic Portraiture. With an Account of the closing scene of his Life, written by his Daughter. Published by the American Tract Society.

The other Leaf of the Book of Nature and Word of God. pp. 74.

This pamphlet contains two sermons, and a series of notes forming an Appendix of thirty pages. The first sermon is on the words, "For the earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof," 1 Cor. x. 26, and is a forcible argument in favour of Agrarianism. The writer argues that the earth is by nature common property. He quotes high authority for the maxim that The real foundation of the rights of property is the Law of the Land. He gives at length the famous paragraph from Paley which earned for the facetious Dean the title of "Pigeon Paley," and which probably cost him a bishopric. He applies to his purpose the golden rule, that we must do to others what we would have them do to us. If, says the writer, I have no land, and my neighbour has five hundred acres, I would certainly wish him to give me fifty; or if he has \$50,000 I should be glad to receive \$10,000. Another poor brother would be no less desirous to get his portion of the superfluous wealth of others, until equality was established. He appeals to the equal distribution of the land of Palestine, by the command of God, and to the numerous denunciations of the love of riches, and the no less



numerous exhortations to brotherhood, to be found in the New Testament. In the second sermon there is a glowing exhibition of the evils, of the injustice, the misery and vice connected with the existing laws of property and its unequal distribution. The author is a slave owner. His design is to show that the arguments of abolitionists are as cogent against property, as against slavery; and that the plea of necessity urged by the rich man at the north, is valid in behalf of the slaveholder at the south. As an argument *ad hominem*, and as a rebuke of the manifest self-righteousness of abolitionists, the sermons are effective. It is, however, dangerous to play with edged tools.

An Essay on the Ecclesiastical History of Scotland. By the Duke of Argyll. Edinburgh: Blackwoods. 8vo.

Observations on Church and State, suggested by the Duke of Argyll's Essay on the Ecclesiastical History of Scotland. Edinburgh and London. Blackwoods. 8vo.

Wilson's Clerical Almanac for Scotland, and Civil and General Register, for 1849; containing complete lists of the ministers of all denominations in Scotland. Edinburgh: Oliphants. 12mo.

Christ on the Mount: a Practical Exposition of the fifth, sixth, and seventh chapters of the gospel according to Matthew. By the Rev. James Gardner, A. M., M. D. Edinburgh: Bell & Bradfute. 8vo.

Sermons, chiefly practical. By the late Thomas Brown, D. D., minister of Free St. John's Church, Glasgow. With a Memoir by Patrick McFarlan, D. D. Greenock. 8vo.

The Seventh Vial, being an Exposition of the Apocalypse, and in particular of the Seventh Vial, with special reference to the present revolution in Europe. Second Edition, bringing down the Historical Exposition to December, 1848. Edinburgh: Johnstone. 8vo.

Theocracy, or the Principles of the Jewish Religion and Polity, adapted to all Nations and Times. By the Rev. Robert Craig, Rothesay. Edinburgh: Johnstone. 8vo.

A Memoir of Annie McDonald Christie, a Self-taught Cottager, chiefly in her own words, with extracts from her letters and meditations. To which is now added a brief memoir of her grandsons, John and Alexander Bethune. By the Rev. J. Brodie. Edinburgh: Johnstone. 18mo.

**Memoirs and Manuscripts of Isobel Hood.** By the late Rev. John McDonald, Calcutta. With an introductory notice, by Hugh Miller; third edition. Edinburgh: Johnstone. 18mo.

**The Women of the Bible:** delineated in a series of sketches of Prominent Females, mentioned in the Holy Scriptures. By a clergyman of the United States. Illustrated by eighteen characteristic steel engravings. Edited by Jonathan M. Wainwright, D. D. pp. 214. Imp. 8vo. 1848. D. Appleton & Co.

**The Sacred Poets of England and America.** From the earliest period to the present time. Chronologically arranged with biographical and critical notices. By Rufus W. Grisworld. Illustrated with steel engravings. 1848. 8vo. D. Appleton & Co.

**The Parables of our Lord.** Richly illuminated with appropriate borders, printed in colors, and in black and gold, square 8vo. D. Appleton & Co. 1849.

**Das Leben der Heiligen.** 4to. Garrigue. N. Y.

**Mrs. Sigourney's Poems;** superb engravings. pp. 408. 8vo. Carey & Hart: Philadelphia.

**Virginia Selection of Psalms and Hymns.** By the late Andrew Broaddus. Drinker and Morris: Richmond.

**St. Vincent's Manual,** containing a selection of Prayers and Devotional Exercises, originally prepared for the use of the Sisters of Charity in the United States. Second edition, revised, enlarged, and adapted to general use; with the approbation of the Superiors. Baltimore: John Murphy.

**The Life of Faith,** in three parts; embracing some of the scriptural principles or doctrines of faith, the power or effects of faith, in the regulation of man's inward nature. By Thomas C. Upham, D. D. Harper & Brothers: New York.

**Letters to Young Men,** on the Cultivation of the Mind, the Formation of Character, and the conduct of Life. By George Burnap. Third edition. Baltimore: John Murphy. 1848.

**The Person and Work of Christ.** By Ernest Sartorius, D. D. Translated by Rev. Oakman J. Stearns, A. M. 18mo. Crocker & Brewster: Boston.

- Tracts for the Christian Seasons. By John Henry Parker. Oxford and London. G. P. Putnam: New York.
- Hahn's Hebrew Bible, with points, reprinted from the last Leipzig edition. 1849. Philadelphia: J. W. Moore.
- A Manual of Morals for Common Schools; also adapted to the use of Sabbath Schools and of Families. Andover: W. H. Wardwell. 1848. 12mo. pp. 175.
- The Happy Christian, a Tale of Home, for Young People. 18mo. pp. 204. D. Appleton & Co.
- Divine and Moral Songs; for the use of Children. By Isaac Watts, D. D. Twenty-four engravings. 16mo. D. Appleton & Co.
- Mamma's Bible Stories, for little Boys and Girls. 16mo. D. Appleton & Co.
- The Idea of Life. Hints towards the formation of a more comprehensive Theory of Life. By S. T. Coleridge. Edited by Seth B. Watson, M. D. Philadelphia. Lea & Blanchard. 1848.
- Annals of the Poor. By the Rev. Leigh Richmond. A new edition, enlarged and illustrated with engravings. Presbyterian Board of Publication: Philadelphia. 12mo. pp. 215.
- Letters of John Quincy Adams to his Son on the Teachings of the Bible. Derby, Miller & Co. Auburn, N. Y.
- Rational Psychology. By Rev. Laurens P. Hickok, D. D. 8vo. pp. 600. Auburn: Derby, Miller, & Co.
- Poole's History of Ecclesiastical Architecture in England. 8vo. pp. 430. London.
- Works of Charlotte Elizabeth, complete. Two vols. 8vo. M. W. Dodd: New York.
- The Vast Army: An Allegory. By the Rev. Henry Moore. Stanford & Swords: New York.
- Poems of Religion and Society. By John Quincy Adams. 1848.
- Maxims and Precepts of the Saviour. A Selection of the most stirring aphorisms and moral precepts of the Saviour. Richly decorated. Also, The Song of Songs, and The Preacher. Missal style. Work by Owen Jones. London.

- The Hemans Reader for Female Schools: containing extracts in Prose and Poetry; selected from the writings of more than one hundred and thirty different authors. By T. S. Pinneo. New York: Clark, Austin & Co. 1848. 12mo. pp. 480.
- The Gospel Promotive of True Happiness. By the Rev. Hugh White. Philadelphia: H. Hooker. 1848. 12mo. pp. 309.
- A Popular Life of George Fox. By Josiah Marsh. Henry Longstreth: Philadelphia.
- Memoirs of Sir T. Fowell Buxton, Bart. With selections from his Correspondence. Edited by his Son, Charles Buxton, Esq. H. Longstreth: Philadelphia.
- Wycliffe's New Testament. 1380. 4to. London: Pickering. New York: Wiley.
- Bagster's Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon. 4to. London.
- Porter's Principles of Textual Criticism. 8vo. London.
- History of the Jesuits. By Adam Steinmetz. Two vols. Crown octavo. Lea & Blanchard.
- The Genius and Design of the Domestic Constitution with its untransferrable obligations and peculiar advantages. By Christopher Anderson. New York: Carters. 12mo. pp. 424.
- Spiritual Heroes, or Sketches of the Puritans, their Character and Times. By John Stoughton. With an Introductory Essay, by Joel Hawes, D. D. New York: Dodd. 12mo.
- The Communicants' Manual, or a Series of Meditations designed to assist communicants in making preparation for the Holy Supper. By J. J. Janeway, D. D. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board. 18mo. pp. 216.
- The Journal of the Pilgrims at Plymouth, in New England, in 1620. Reprinted from the original volume. With Historical and local Illustrations of Providence, Principles, and Persons. By George B. Cheever, D. D. New York: Wiley. 8vo.
- Select Christian Authors, with Introductory Essays. Containing; The Christian's Defence against Infidelity—Memoir of Halyburton—Wilberforce's Practical View of Christianity—Doddridge's Rise and Progress—Adam's Private Thoughts



- on Religion—Howe's Redeemer's Tears—The Imitation of Christ. New York: Carters. Two vols. 8vo.
- Men and Scenes before the Flood. By a Pastor. Philadelphia. Presbyterian Board. 4to. pp. 140.
- Cyclopedia of Moral and Religious Anecdotes. By Rev. K. Arvine, A. M. Pastor of the Providence Church, New York. With an Introduction by Rev. George B. Cheever, D.D. New York. Leavitt, Trow, & Co. 8vo.
- Christ is All. By Stephen H. Tyng, D.D. Rector of St. George's Church, New York. Carters. 8vo. pp. 374.
- Letters to the Rt. Rev. John Hughes; and Bishop Hughes Confuted. By Kirwan. New York. Leavitt, Trow, & Co. 3 volumes in one.
- Annals of the Poor. By the Rev. Legh Richmond. Illustrated with Engravings. Philadelphia. Presbyterian Board. 12mo. pp. 216.
- The last Days of Elisha, from the German of F. W. Krummacher, D.D. New York. Carters. 12mo. pp. 297.
- A New Token for Children. Philadelphia. Presbyterian Board. 18mo. pp. 210.
- Horæ Paulinæ, or the Truth of the Scripture History of St. Paul evinced. By William Paley, D.D. New York. Carters. 8vo. pp. 260.
- Brief Memoirs of the Pious. Philadelphia. Presbyterian Board. 18mo. pp. 264.
- The Bible Expositor, or Confirmations of the Truth of the Holy Scriptures from the observations of recent travellers, illustrating the manners, customs, and places referred to in the Bible. Published under the direction of the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge. New York. Carters. 8vo. pp. 320.
- The Causes and Cure of Skepticism. Philadelphia. Presbyterian Board. 32mo. pp. 124.
- The True Christian Exemplified in a series of addresses from a pastor to his own people. By John Angell James. New York. Carters. 12mo. pp. 205.
- The Widow Directed to the Widow's God. By John Angell James. New York. Carters. 12mo. pp. 205.

The Test of Truth. By Mary Jane Graham. New York. Carters. 12mo. pp. 163.

Lexicon Manuale Hebraicum et Chaldaicum in Veteris Testamenti Libros. Post editionem Germanicam tertiam latine elaboravit multisque modis retractavit et auxit Guil. Gesenius. Editio altera emendatior ab auctore ipso adornata atque ab A. T. Hoffmann Theologo Jenensi recognita. Leipsick. Vogel. 8vo. pp. 1037.

The National Lyre. A new Collection of Psalm and Hymn Tunes. By T. Parkinson Tuckerman, Silas A. Bancroft, and H. K. Oliver. Wilkins, Carter & Co., Boston.

The Choice Chorus Book. By A. N. Johnson, professor in the Boston Academy of Music. Wilkins & Carter. Boston.

Bible Gallery; 18 plates; royal 8vo. London.

The New York Ecclesiologist, No. I. H. M. Onderdonk. N. Y.

The Combatants: An Allegory, by the Rev. Edward Moore with illustrations by Darley.—The King's Messengers, an Allegorical Tale. By the Rev. W. Adams, Fellow of Merton College, Oxford. Prot. Ep. S. S. Union. N. Y.

Friday Christian; or the First-Born of Pitcairn's Island. By a Poor "Member of Christ." 18mo. pp. 138. D. Appleton & Co.

Evidences of Natural and Revealed Religion. Also the Doctrines and Institutions of Christianity. By the author of "Reasons why I am a Churchman." Prot. Ep. S. S. Union. 18mo. pp. 244. N. York.

Short Sermons to Little Children. By W. S. Plumer. A. S. S. Union. Philadelphia.

Book of Hymns. Edited by Longfellow and Johnson. 16mo. 2d edition. Wm. D. Ticknor & Co. Boston.

Angel Voices; or Words of Counsel, for overcoming the World. 18mo. W. D. Ticknor & Co. Boston.

Sermons on Consolation: By Rev. F. P. W. Greenwood. 16mo. Same.

Josephus, translated by Whiston. New Edition. Two vols. 8vo. London and New York. D. Appleton & Co.

Sermons by the Rev. James Richards, D.D., with an Essay on

his character by William B. Sprague, D.D. Albany. E. H. Pease & Co. N. York. Carter & Brothers.

**The Aged Christian's Companion:** containing a variety of Essays, adapted to the Improvement, Consolation and Encouragement of Persons advanced in Life. By the Rev. John Stanford, D.D. Stanford & Swords. N. York.

**Sermons delivered in the Chapel of Brown University** by Francis Wayland, President of the University. 12mo. Gould, Kendall & Lincoln. Boston.

**Cowper's Poetical Works.** With a biography and Introduction by the Rev. Thomas Dale. 2 vols. 8vo. Harper & Brothers.

**The Life of Christ.** Illustrated by Adams. Harpers.

**Daily Bread,** consisting of extracts in prose and verse from eminent divines, for every day in the year. Philadelphia. Presbyterian Board of Publication. 18mo. pp. 288.

**The Poor Man's Morning and Evening Portion,** being a selection of a verse of scripture with short observations for every day in the year, intended for the use of the poor in spirit, who are rich in faith and heirs of the kingdom. New York. Robert Carter & Brothers. 2 vols. 12mo.

**Grace Raymond, or the Evil and Cure of a Passionate Temper.** Philadelphia. American Sunday School Union. 18mo. pp. 104.

**Memoir of Mary Jane Graham,** late of Stoke Fleming, Devon. Abridged from the memoir written by the Rev. Charles Bridges, M. A. Philadelphia. Presbyterian Board. 18mo. pp. 216.

**Original Thoughts on Scripture,** being the substance of sermons preached by the late Rev. Richard Cecil, A. M., never before published, taken down by Mrs. Hawkes, and now edited by Catharine Cecil. New York. Carters. 12mo. pp. 452.

**Schools of Ancient Philosophy.** Philadelphia. Am. S. S. Union 18mo. pp. 192.

**Walks of Usefulness in London and its Environs.** By the Rev. John Campbell, Kingsland. Philadelphia. Presbyterian Board. 18mo. pp. 172.

**Modern Accomplishments, or the March of Intellect.** By Miss

Catharine Sinclair. New York. Carters. 12mo. pp. 276.

Eagle Hill, or Selections in Prose and Verse, chiefly original. Philadelphia. A. S. S. U. 18mo. pp. 112.

Milton's Poetical Works, illustrated by 120 exquisite engravings. With a memoir and critical remarks on his genius and writings, by James Montgomery. New York. Harpers. 2 vols. 8vo.

An American Dictionary of the English language, containing the whole vocabulary of the first edition in two volumes quarto, the entire corrections and improvements of the second edition in two volumes, royal octavo; to which is prefixed an Introductory Dissertation, on the Origin, History, and Connection of the languages of Western Asia and Europe, with an explanation of the principles on which languages are formed. By Noah Webster, LL.D., member of the Am. Phil. Society, Philadelphia; Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in Massachusetts; Member of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences; Fellow of the Royal Society of Northern Antiquaries in Copenhagen; Member of the Connecticut Historical Society; Corresponding Member of the Historical Societies in Massachusetts, New York and Georgia; of the Academy of Medicine in Philadelphia; and of the Columbian Institute in Washington; and a honorary member of the Michigan Historical Society. Revised and enlarged, by Chauncey A. Goodrich, Professor in Yale College. Springfield, Mass. G. & C. Merriam. 4to. pp. 1367.

This is certainly a great improvement on all former editions of Webster's Dictionary. Both in orthography and orthoepy, many of the deviations from the common English standard have been corrected. The execution of the plan is also more complete, and the compression of the whole into a single volume makes it much more convenient. These improvements do great credit to the editor, as the typographical execution does to the publishers and printers. Without any change of opinions formerly expressed, as to Dr. Webster's principles, we have no disposition to deny the merit of the work, as a fruit of extraordinary industry and learning, and as a necessary part of every English scholar's learned apparatus.



## CONTENTS OF NO. I.

<b>ART. I.—1. American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions.</b>	
Special Report of the Prudential Committee, on the control to be exercised over Missionaries and Mission Churches. Printed for the use of the Board at the Annual Meeting. Revised edition.	
2. Correspondence between the Cherokee and Choctaw Missions, the Rev. S. B. Treat, and the Prudential Committee. Missionary Herald, October, 1848. - - - - -	
	1
<b>ART. II.—The Work claiming to be the Constitutions of the Holy Apostles, including the Canons; Whiston's version, revised from the Greek; with a Prize Essay at the University of Bonn, upon their origin and contents; translated from the German, by Irah Chase, D.D. - - - - -</b>	
	<b>42</b>
<b>ART. III.—The History of Catechizing. - - - - -</b>	
	<b>59</b>
<b>ART. IV.—The Free Church Pulpit, consisting of Discourses by the most eminent Divines of the Free Church of Scotland in three volumes. - - - - -</b>	
	<b>82</b>
<b>ART. V.—Divine Providence: or the Three Cycles of Revelation, showing the parallelism of the Patriarchal, Jewish, and Christian dispensations. Being a new evidence of the Divine origin of Christianity. By the Rev. George Croly, LL.D. - - - - -</b>	
	<b>97</b>
<b>ART. VI.—A Manual of Presbytery (comprising tracts by the Rev. Dr. Miller of Princeton and the Rev. Mr. Lorimer of Glasgow.) Second edition revised and enlarged. - - - - -</b>	
	<b>116</b>
<b>ART. VII.—An Introduction to the New Testament, containing an examination of the most important questions relating to the authority, interpretation, and integrity of the canonical books, with reference to the latest inquiries. By Samuel Davidson, LL.D. Volume I. The Four Gospels. - - - - -</b>	
	<b>144</b>
<b>QUARTERLY LIST OF NEW PUBLICATIONS. - - - - -</b>	
	<b>149</b>



THE  
PRINCETON REVIEW.

APRIL 1849.

---

No. II.

---

ART. I.—*The Natural History of Man ; Comprising Inquiries into the modifying influence of Physical and Moral Agencies on the different tribes of the Human Family.* By J. C. Prichard, M. D. London : Baillere, 1843.

THE late decease of Dr. Prichard has given a death blow to the high hopes of farther contributions to the science of man, from his learned pen. If he had put forth no other work than this, it alone would have sufficed to give him an imperishable renown. The learning displayed in his work is not more remarkable, than the ability with which it is all brought to bear upon the particular subject before him, and the cool, quiet, and dispassionate manner, in which he conducts his inquiries, and grapples with the difficulties in his way. He has no preconceived, or pre-adopted theory to support. He takes mankind as they are, presenting certain phenomena. He seeks an explanation of these phenomena, which shall accord with philosophy, and pursuing a process of the most rigid induction, disdains to receive as conclusive aught that is not most thoroughly demonstrated ; or as evidence, what a sound philosophy would reject

as insufficient. The principle by which he has been guided is calmly and with characteristic judgment laid down in this passage;

"The strict rule of scientific scrutiny exacts, according to modern philosophers, in matters of inductive reasoning, an exclusive homage. It requires that we should close our eyes against all presumptive and extrinsic evidence, and abstract our minds from all considerations, not derived from the matters of fact which bear immediately on the question. The maxim we have to follow in such controversies is "*fiat justitia, ruat cælum*." In fact, what is actually true, it is always most desirable to know, whatever consequences may arise from its admission." p. 7.

Shutting out thus from his view every species of evidence that can be deemed at all extrinsic; losing sight even of the testimony of the scriptures, and taking mankind as he finds them, he proceeds to apply the principles of induction, in order to ascertain, if possible, somewhat of their history. So various and conflicting have been the theories of philosophers upon this one subject, that peculiar calmness is needed in him who would conduct an investigation free from passion, pride, and prejudice, and who, rejecting all evidence that is not strictly internal, would confine himself exclusively to the phenomena themselves. Where there is no theory to support, there is comparatively little difficulty in conducting such an investigation. The facts alone are to be considered; and as each gives in its distinct and independent witness to be recorded, the accumulated witness of these independent facts constitutes the only data from which sound reason can draw her conclusions. But, difficulties there are; because no student can be ignorant of the fact that theories of all sorts have been advanced and maintained upon this subject; and at every step of his progress, would our inductive philosopher find himself tempted to accept the proffered aid of some one of these theories, where it chanced at the moment to run parallel with the line of his investigation, and, lured by the momentary parallelism, to imagine that the issue of the theory is the actual result of induction. We have admired the singleness of aim, the steadiness of purpose, the resolute rejection of all extrinsic evidence, and the calmness and sobriety, which characterise the inquiry of Dr. Prichard. The subject is one of



the deepest moment, and he gives himself up entirely to its close examination; not regardless of the solemnity of the issue, but anxious to reach the truth, whatever it may be, satisfied that in this matter, "whatever is, is right." The question is one which has nothing to do with the age of the world, or with the number of centuries which have elapsed since the creation of man. Mankind exist, not one in form, in feature, and in colour, but differing greatly in all these particulars. There are, it is true, remarkable points of resemblance between the different races; and this resemblance is not, of course, to be overlooked, in any investigation, because, while the tendency of the differences between the several tribes is at first, to an independent origin for each, the resemblance between them all, becomes a powerful centripetal argument which binds them all in one. In making this remark we are not anticipating the results of our author's labours, because whatever the issue of his argument, the argument itself would be essentially defective if it considered the points of difference, and made no account of those of resemblance. His business is, as he says, with the facts alone. But with all the facts, not with one to the exclusion of others. So that while investigating the differences which constitute the phenomena, he could not, as an inductive reasoner, nay as any sort of searcher after truth, lose sight of the disposition which those differences have to a common centre. Of all the authors with whose writings we are conversant, Dr. Prichard is among the most unlikely to be guilty of any such oversight, or to err in his positions and deductions. His directness of aim is remarkable. He has an astonishing facility of stripping his subject of all that does not properly pertain to it, and causing it to stand out in the simple outline, too plain to be misunderstood, and carrying by its very naturalness, conviction to the judgment. We are not saying too much when we express it as our deliberate opinion, that few can return from the pleasing exercise of accompanying Dr. Prichard, in his investigations, without the firm conviction that he is entirely right, and that his conclusions are irresistible.

We have said that the differences constitute the phenomena. These differences are so very marked, as would surprise one who had never examined the subject, if among the members of a civilized nation we can find any in ignorance upon this point.

But even to the most intelligent minds the extent of these differences is very remarkable. Not only the extent of the variety, but the *fact* of such variety affords abundant scope for both curious and profitable investigation; for there are few thoughtful minds to which the questions would not occur, did Providence originally create these varieties as distinct? or were they originated by His subsequent interposition? or again, can they be traced to the influence of climate and other agencies? Of late years especially, this subject has excited deep attention among the learned. We need only mention the noble work of our countryman Dr. Morton, in which, from a careful and scientific examination of the skulls of the different Indian races, he has reached the same conclusion as Dr. Prichard. This work and the one under review, will go down to posterity as perfectly unanswerable; and will prove to the world at large the shallowness of every system of philosophy that does not pay implicit homage to the most rigid induction from existent facts. Of Dr. Morton and his work we need say no more, than that we rejoice, and are proud, that an American has given to the world a work of such sterling worth, which may properly claim the homage of the loftiest intellect, asking nothing from the most searching criticism, stepping up at once to its lofty niche in the philosophical temple, to be pondered by wisdom, as it enunciates its pregnant oracles.

The earth is peopled by eight hundred or a thousand millions of inhabitants, exhibiting almost every variety of form, and feature. The European occupies one extreme, and the Negro the other; while between these the Asiatic and the American are embraced. In each of these grand divisions there are also sectional characteristics, which, in a full and accurate survey of the whole race, it would not do to overlook. But it is with the grand divisions alone, that the present subject has to do, because it is against the prominent characteristics of these, that the objections are so strenuously urged. No difference could well be more marked, than those which exist between the European and the genuine Negro, in every respect. They resemble each other in that they are upright, and have each a measure of intelligence; but in grace, in symmetry, in expanse of intellect, in feature, they are as wide as possible apart. But it is remarkable that local circumstances have so little been brought to bear

upon the explanation of this difference, and that men—misnamed Philosophers—should have assumed at the outset that the real difference consisted in mental and moral peculiarities. The theory against which Dr. Prichard's work aims its ponderous blows, and which, we are sorry to know, is extremely prevalent even among scientific men,—particularly in this country—is that there are races commonly and for convenience ranked as human beings, who so little deserve the name, that they are, in fact, but half men, occupying a midway place in the great scale of being between the baboon and man. This theory, once started, gave rise to another, in that there is an obvious vacuum between man and the ape, if there be not this demi-man to come between them,—a vacuum which the order of Providence in other ranks of creation, it is thought, shows to be against His design. We have remarked that this notion prevails extensively among men of science. If this be deemed incredible, we can only say that we have been pained to find many of the best educated minds of our country, holding this degrading idea. But it is observable that none beside the African race come beneath this fearful proscription. Several reasons may be adduced for this. In the first place their servitude, which has so long continued as to be looked upon as the only state of existence of which the race is worthy; and in the second place, the European standard being assumed as the model of all that is excellent, the African assumes such an aspect of deformity as to sink at once into downright ugliness, and consequently, to many, into an actual Simianism. Now, it is a fact, that long continued servitude, has a tendency to weaken the mental powers, and to induce low and debasing views of one's self, and of one's existence. The absence of education, may, in part, account for this; but rather, we apprehend, must its explanation be sought in the treatment of the slave. He is not treated as a man. It is assumed in his case, that he is a degree or two below man,—no matter how many degrees—he is not a man; and then when this is assumed, why should he not be treated accordingly. It is true that this idea is contradicted by the nature of his servitude; a servitude that requires thought and reasoning. He is not always, he is seldom, under such a bondage that his own thinking powers are not called into action. He is expected to think and act for himself, even when doing the bidding of another, and an

unintentional compliment is paid to his understanding in the very grounds on which he is scourged for not fulfilling his master's wishes. But this makes no difference in the general account. The nonsense—we can call it nothing else—which thus degrades the sable progeny of Ham, into a mere progeny of improved baboons, is its own answer, and its own refutation. We ought, indeed, to apologise to our readers for dwelling upon it at all. But the error exists; and some wise man has wisely said, that as error does harm, the best way to overcome, is not to laugh at, nor to ridicule, nor to treat it with contempt, but to meet, answer, and expose it. We do not confess to quite the philosophic calmness of Dr. Prichard, who sits down to examine this particular point with as much gravity of countenance, and as much earnestness and seriousness of manner as though the fate of the world were dependent upon the issue. In truth, it is not a question to be smiled at. There are consequences both moral and spiritual, dependent upon the issue, which are very momentous. And, ridiculous though it is, we are so fully persuaded of its evil tendency, that we rejoice for the sake of humanity and philosophy that Dr. Prichard has condescended to notice and expose its erroneousness. In so doing, he has gone upon the principle that no error is unimportant or harmless; and, finding current a theory that, pushed to its legitimate extent, would make monkeys of all our ancestry, for white and black must ultimately come under the same denominate pater-nity, he sits down to reason with these misnamed philosophers, misnamed certainly, as respects this department, and to prove to them by argument at once cogent and irresistible, that their premises are unsound, their conclusions unwarrantable, and that they have risked by their shallowness in this particular, the forfeit to all claim upon the title of Philosophers. The evil is a serious one. It has a most demoralizing and inhumanizing tendency, whether the objection be urged seriously, or only as an excuse to ourselves for not contributing to the happiness and well being of so many of our fellow men. If it be urged in the former mood, then many millions of beings, most marvel-lously apportioned like ourselves, in mental and physical endowments, are placed, so far as we are concerned, in the grand Index Expergatoria of Creation, ticketed as prohibited, whom to touch were to bring down upon ourselves the anathema of



science, truly so called, and to exclude us from every society save that of the most benevolent, animal-improving fanaticism. It is a weighty consideration. It is attended with most fearful responsibility; for it cuts off from the great brotherhood of humanity all these millions; and denies them all claim to humanity or its attributes. But if it be urged as an excuse for not contributing to their happiness, its utter heartlessness, bespeaks its condemnation. And the readiness with which we can consign to mere animal existence all these millions, tends to deaden our sense of morals, and our perception of the claims of humanity. These millions are men, or they are not. If they are not human, we have no other obligation towards them than we have toward any other race of mere animals. But upon this point it is immensely important that we be duly certified; for if they prove to be human, there are obligations thence resulting, which we have no right to disregard, and to disregard which must be at our peril. The great law of brotherhood which binds all our race in one, demands from each member of the family a treatment which shall, at least, recognize every other as a man. The bond which binds a family together is of course more sacred, and the duties which belong to each member, are of a far higher order than those which pertain to the race in general. But there are duties, none will deny it, owing to those who are descended from our one common parent, and if "God has made of one blood all the nations which are upon the face of the earth," and by any satisfactory process, it can be determined that any nation have a just claim to partnership in that "one blood," not only have we no right to deny the relationship, but they have a claim upon our respect and sympathy, which it were imbecility even to question. Their degradation affects not in the least the validity of this claim. That may arise from causes over which they have no control. It only remains to be ascertained if there are any solid grounds for including them in the partnership of blood; and soon as these grounds are ascertained, their rank in the animal kingdom is determined, whatever their degradation. And the ascertaining of this point evolves the one deeply important duty of seeking their elevation and improvement. They are our brethren, and the duty of brethren is to seek to benefit each other. And if we, as a race, have advantages—especially mental and moral advantages—

which others have not, the obligation is devolved upon us by Providence to impart them to them, in order that they may be elevated, and take their just rank in the scale of being, and of nations.

We are aware, how strong is the prejudice which such a suggestion as this must encounter in many minds. Taught to look upon the African race as greatly beneath them, it comes to pass that the idea gradually and imperceptibly insinuates itself that they are of altogether a different race, with no claims upon our sympathy such as the Europeans, Asiatics, and the Indians of our own country possess. Dr. Prichard, expressing the opinions of certain so-called philosophers of his land, upon this point, says, "Nothing, in the opinion of persons who maintain this doctrine, can exceed the folly manifested by the people and parliament of England, when under a mistaken impulse of what was termed philanthropy, or an erroneous notion of rights which have no existence, they committed the absurd act of emancipating from the precise condition which was most appropriate to their nature, a tribe of creatures incapable of governing themselves, and of combining for objects of mutual interest in a civilised community. If these opinions are not every day expressed in this country, it is because the avowal of them is restrained by a degree of odium that would be excited by it. In some other countries they are not at all disguised." p. 6.

We pause here, simply to remark that if by this latter remark, Dr. Prichard especially refers to America, we apprehend he labours under an error with regard to the prevalence of this notion. There are, we know, many who hold just this idea, both in the South and in the North, but extended observation in person enables us to say with some degree of positiveness, that in the South, such a sentiment is by no means general. Slavery is looked upon by very large numbers as a great evil, which their ancestry have entailed upon them, and which they would, if they could, break up. But there are serious, and, at present insurmountable difficulties in the way. For, in the first place, the laws of most, if not all of the slave-holding states, forbid the liberation of slaves if they are meant to reside in the states; and in the second place, if they liberate them, the slaves can throw themselves back upon their masters, and by the laws, the masters must protect and provide for them. The class of

slaveholders of whom we are now speaking, though prohibited from educating their slaves in secular learning, are not prohibited from giving them religious instruction, nor are they required to prevent the slaves from educating themselves. In Maryland the slaveholder has no restrictions imposed upon him by the statute, though he has by his purse; for it would require a large and long purse to educate from fifty to three hundred persons. Not one slaveholder in ten could do it. Then again, it must be remembered that the larger portion of the Southern planters are gentlemen, and possessed of refined, and in many instances, northern education. Of these, wherever educated, a very large portion are aware of their responsibility to their slaves, and seek to mitigate the severity of their bondage. Some of them—and we are happy to know that the number is increasing—have handsome chapels upon their plantations, and employ a resident chaplain at their own expense, whose business it is to instruct the slaves in the great truths and duties of revealed religion. This is not a perfect substitute for education, but it is supplying the deficiency with an expedient, which while it teaches the slave his ultimate destiny, and his duty to God and man, shows also, that, in the opinion of his master he is something more than a half man, half brute. But to proceed with Dr. Prichard.

“Nor is it easy to prove any of the conclusions unreasonable, if only the principle fact be what it is assumed to be. If the Negro, and the Australian are not our fellow-creatures and of one family with ourselves, but beings of an inferior order, and if duties towards them were not contemplated, as we may, in that case presume them not to have been, in any of the positive commands on which the morality of the Christian world is founded, our relation to these tribes will appear to be not very different from those which might be imagined to subsist between us and a race of oranges. In the story of a pongo slaughtered by some voyagers in the Indian Archipelago, an account of the cries and gestures of the animal in its mortal agony, so like the expressions of human sufferings, was read not without pity; and many persons censured the wanton commission of an outrage for which there appeared no adequate motive. But the capturing of such creatures with the view of making them useful slaves, even if some of them were occasionally destroyed in the attempt, would

be scarcely blamed. We thus come near to an apology for the practice of kidnapping, at which our forefathers connived, though it did not occur to them to defend it on so reasonable a ground. The kind-hearted Abbé Grégoire tells us with indignation, that on the arrival of blood-hounds from Cuba in the island of St. Domingo, "On leur livra, par maniere d'essai, le premier Nègre qui se trouva sous la main." He adds "La promptitude avec laquelle ils dévorèrent cette curée réjouit des tigres blancs à figure humaine." Those who hold that the Negro is of a distinct species from our own, and of a different and inferior grade in the scale of beings, smile at the good Abbé's simplicity, and observe that it cannot be much more criminal to destroy such creatures when they are among us, than to extirpate wolves or bears; nor do they strongly reprobate the conduct of some white people in our Australian colony, who are said to have shot occasionally the poor miserable savages of that country as food for the dogs." pp. 6, 7.

As we have already remarked, it is of very grave importance, that the relation of the African race to ourselves be ascertained. If they are our brethren, let us know it, and if they are not, let us know it. Let the precise amount, and the utmost extent of our responsibility be ascertained. Now, it might be supposed that the scriptures would give us some light upon this subject, and to *our* apprehension, their testimony is very clear and distinct. We see no difficulty involving the subject, with the book of Genesis before us, and with the testimony of the apostle that "He hath made of one blood, all the nations that dwell upon the earth." But then it is contended that this revelation was made only for the race of Adam, and that the Negro bears upon his deformed person, and upon his stunted intellect the signet of the Almighty that he is of a totally different race. Of course this is a mere assumption of which no other proof is adduced than his supposed deformity in mind and body. But it is necessary to meet this objection, and to meet it with unquestionable evidence, even though the objection refuses to yield to the force of the testimony adduced. It might be deemed sufficient that we show the objector unnumbered instances of deformity in mind and body among our own race. But the answer is returned, that these instances are clearly exceptions, and only exceptions to a general rule. The Negro, on the con-



trary, furnishes the case of a whole nation, of various tribes, with scarce any exceptions to the imbecility of mind, and with none to the deformity of the body. We are therefore to show some more substantial proof that the Negro is a man before he can be admitted to a place in our sympathy. Now, we are of those who believe that the God of revelation is also the God of nature, and that "there is such a sameness of dealing,"—to use the language of the eloquent Melville, "characteristic of the natural and the spiritual, that the Bible may be read in the outspread of the landscape, and the operations of agriculture; whilst, conversely, the laws obeyed by this earth and its productions may be traced as pervading the appointments of revelation. . . . . If there run the same principle through natural and spiritual things, through the book of nature and the Bible, we vindicate the same authorship to both, and prove, with an almost geometric precision, that the God of creation is also the God of Christianity."\* The same train of thought is equally applicable to the *facts* as to the truths of the Bible; and if so, we can hardly fail to find some evidence in the natural world to confirm this testimony of the Bible.

Let it be remembered, that the objection which we are now refuting considers the Negro as not a *man* but a brute—but one remove above the *Simian* race. Now, it is a fixed law of nature that while two distinct classes of animals may amalgamate, their offspring is utterly incapable of reproducing its likeness. On the contrary it is a barren hybrid, a monstrous abortion, upon which nature has fixed her indelible signet of disapprobation and horror, by causing that it shall cease with its own existence. With regard to the reasons for this, we have nothing at present to do. We are concerned only for the fact. The horse and the ass will amalgamate, but the mule is barren. It has never been known to perpetuate its image. Any result of amalgamation that can be perpetuated, indicates a oneness of origin. This is an invariable rule. Of course, then if the Negro be of a different race, the fruit of his union with the white race will be barren. But we know it is not. The mulatto is as fertile as either of his parents; and his identity of origin is proved by this fact without a question. It is astonishing that this

\* Melville's *Sermons*, Vol. I. p. 61. Am. Ed.

so evident a fact should not at once silence the inhuman objection. It shows that nature herself has placed her ban upon every union that is not of similar kinds; and that while amalgamated races of similar kinds may be perpetuated, no two races that are not similar, can possibly pass beyond a certain limit. A great, a very marked difference is perceptible in the *dog*. The difference between the several kinds is so very great, as to lead at first to the conclusion that they are of wholly different races, for there can be scarcely more difference between the *ape* and the *man*, than there is between the *terrier* and the *Newfoundland dog*. Yet these can be, and have been crossed, and their offspring by their progenitive powers demonstrably prove that they belong to one and the same genus.

There are other grounds on which the same conclusion can be reached; and it has occurred to us that there is one argument against this theory which ought to be, and to our apprehension is, irresistible. It is, that man is the only creature upon this earth who has any idea or is capable of forming any, so far as is known to us, of a Supreme Being. Now, supposing for one moment that the gift of speech was not an evidence of humanity, the fact that the Negro wherever found, has some conception of a Supreme Being marks him off as a man—and what is quite as much to the purpose, seems to us to mark him off as possessed of the same ancestry as ourselves. If the fact be deemed inconclusive upon this latter point, certainly, when taken in connection with the traditions which prevail among them, this point must be considered as settled beyond a question; for if the gift of speech, and the known apprehension of a Supreme Being afford no argument for either humanity, or fraternity with ourselves, it is impossible that the same traditions should be universal unless there were a common parentage. Now, the Negro has, even in his lowest estate, some apprehension of an infinite Being who stands towards him the relation of his Creator. His ideas may be very imperfect, as of course, they will be. But he has some ideas respecting a God, which he is able to express. They may be proved the lowest of men; but we place their recognition of a Supreme Being as positive and irrefragable evidence of their title to rank as members of the genus *Homo*. It seems to us to be surprising that this fact should have been overlooked, though perhaps not more surpris-

sing than that the theory which it opposes should have been started.

It is true that this fact is one which scarcely pertains to the course of argument prescribed for himself by Dr. Prichard; but it is one that is so intimately connected with it, that we have been tempted to digress a little from the argument itself. We return to the points on which Dr. P. has dwelt with so much power.

A weighty item of the evidence is to be found in the colloquial powers of the Negro. The expression of emotions either of pain or pleasure, by articulate sound is not peculiar to man. But it is his characteristic that he can express these emotions by the tongue in a regular sequence of thought. Animals of all kinds may have some mode of communication with each other, but the faculty of articulate speech belongs to man alone. However rude the language in its structure—no nation has yet been discovered that has not its own language capable of being reduced to some grammatical order. Even the Bushmen, who have been deemed the most degraded, and the least like men, have had their language reduced to order; and it has been found on a careful analysis to be framed much like the languages of more educated nations. Their roots are rugged, but simple; and they are found to bear a most striking analogy to the roots of the ancient Hebrew. The Bushmen moreover, are found to be capable of acquiring other languages; for the missionaries have been successful in their endeavors to teach them the English language. And we recently learned from one who had spent much time among them, they learned quite as readily as the boys and girls in America. When it can be shown that any of the Simian race have this capacity, it will be time enough to refuse to the fact we have mentioned the authority which we assert it to possess. Hear Dr. Prichard:

“We contemplate among all the diversified tribes, who are endowed with reason and speech, the same internal feelings, appetencies, aversions; the same inward convictions, the same sentiments of subjection to invisible powers, and, more or less fully developed, of accountableness or responsibility to unseen avengers of wrong, and agents of retributive justice, from whose tribunal men cannot even by death escape. We find every where, the same susceptibility, though not always in the same

degree of forwardness or ripeness of improvement, of admitting the cultivation of these universal endowments, of opening the eyes of the mind to the more clear and luminous views which Christianity unfolds, of becoming moulded to the institutions of religion and of civilized life; in a word, the same inward and mental nature is to be recognised in all the races of man. When we compare this fact with the observations which have been heretofore fully established as to the specific instincts and separate physical endowments of all the distinct tribes of sentient beings in the universe, we are all entitled to draw confidently the conclusion, that all human races are of one species and one family." p. 546.

There are no points connected with this subject which Dr. Prichard has not examined with critical skill, and on which he does not furnish a mass of valuable information. We have space for only a few brief extracts, which it is due to the learned author to acknowledge, give but an imperfect idea of the arguments and facts contained in this volume. In allusion to the ethnographical facts which he had adduced, he presents among others, the following inferences.

"The different races of man are not distinguished from each other by strongly marked, uniform, and permanent distinctions, as are the several species belonging to any given tribe of animals. All the diversities which exist are variable, and pass into each other by insensible gradations; and there is, moreover, scarcely an instance in which the actual transition cannot be proved to have taken place.

"This, if we consider the varieties of figure which are generally looked upon as the most important, and begin with those of the skeleton and the skull as their foundation, we shall find every particular type undergoing deviations, and passing into other forms. We have seen that, in many races who have, generally, and originally, as far as we can go back towards their origin, heads of the pyramidal figure with broad faces as the Mongolian type, the oval or European shape, with European features, display themselves in individuals, and often become the characteristics of tribes. "Again the shape of the head in the black races varies in like manner. . . . Among the aboriginal races of the new world, similar varieties and similar deviations occur. We have seen that the nations of America,



are not, as has been represented, reducible to one physical type." pp. 473, 475.

With regard to colour, his remarks are exceedingly interesting, and we only regret that we have not room for more than the following conclusions: "If we begin with Africa, we shall find a great number of distinct races, as far as a total diversity of language can be thought to distinguish man into separate races, spread over that great continent; and it may be observed, that those whose abode is between the tropics, though differing from each other in many particulars, agree in the darkness of their complexion. In fact, if we divide Africa into three portions, we may define by the tropics, the extent of the black complexion in its inhabitants." p. 476.

The so-called *woolly* hair of the Negro has been the butt of ridicule, and much labour of microscopic analysis has been bestowed upon it. It was at one time pronounced a genuine wool, having all the properties of wool, and none of hair. But Dr. Prichard, who does not hesitate to examine everything connected with his subject, with the strictest philosophical acumen, has brought the so-called wool to the test of a strict microscopic examination, and the result is that it is found to be no wool at all, nor any thing approaching to wool, but veritable, genuine hair; as much hair as that of those who would fain have the negro clothed with wool. In the first place it was discovered that wool and hair are entirely dissimilar in their nature and structure; and that the ground of difference was to be found chiefly in the different quantity of colouring matter in the capillary tubes. In the second place, it is ascertained, that the hair of the negro is much more copiously supplied with the pigment than the hair of other nations; a fact, which, while it cannot as yet be said to account with certainty for the frizzly appearance of the hair, is supposed to have an intimate connection with it. But whatever the cause, it is very certain that the covering which the Creator has provided for the head of the negro is altogether different in its structure from wool, and the argument, if argument it can be called, is proved utterly worthless, which on such an assumption would displace the negro from his position as a man, and rank him among the tribes of irrational creatures.

The concluding remarks of Dr. Prichard, in which he sums

up the argument through which he has so successfully passed, present a concise summary upon this particular point. He says:

"The nature of the hair is, perhaps, one of the most permanent characteristics of different races. The hair of the Negro has been termed woolly; it is not wool, and only differs from the hair of other races in less important respects. This subject has been discussed in the early part of my work, and I shall not repeat what has there been said. It may be seen that the texture of the hair affords in the animal kingdom no specific characters. In mankind we find it in every gradation of variety; and if we take the African nations, I mean the black tribes, who are apparently of genuine native origin, as one body, we shall discover among them every possible gradation in the texture of the hair, from the short close curls of the Kafir, to the crisp but bushy locks of the Berberine, and again, to the flowing hair of the black Tuaryk, or Tibbo. In some instances, indeed, it appears that the change from one to the other may be shown in actual transition." p. 477.

The few remaining points, on which our author dwells, we regret that we are unable at present to notice. We have said enough, however, to show the great value of the labours of Dr. Prichard, enough also as we hope to induce our readers to procure it for themselves.

---

ART. II.—*The Primacy of the Apostolic See Vindicated.* By Francis Patrick Kenrick, Bishop of Philadelphia. Published by M. Fithian, 72 North Second street.

ON the second page of this volume, after the title-page, are these words: "To the Hon. Roger B. Taney, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, as a small tribute to his eminent station, profound knowledge, incorruptible integrity, pure patriotism, and devoted attachment to the Catholic faith, the following work is respectfully inscribed by the author." On this dedication, we observe, as citizens, that we have no objection to the Chief Justice being a papist, or to a papist being Chief Justice. We wish to see no favoritism or exclusion prac-

ticed towards any body of men, who may have a permanent interest in the welfare of this country. We believe Mr. Taney is an amiable man, a good lawyer, and an able judge. In all his good name we rejoice. The inscription of this work was made either with or without his consent. If without his consent, he is not responsible for it; nor do we know that it would be either dignified or proper in Mr. Taney to take public notice of it. But if Mr. Taney consented, in a formal or informal manner, that the volume should be inscribed to him, knowing its character, we cannot, in this case, admire either his taste or his judgment.

We do not object to our public men, who, holding permanent or temporary offices, openly sanctioning publications calculated to promote morals or piety. Nay, we should like to see them writing on such subjects. A work like Wilberforce's "Practical View," is an honour to its author and to his country. We should be delighted to meet a hundred works of the same spirit and ability from our own countrymen, who are not clergymen. A few pious laymen in this land have done well in this cause. And we happen to know that nothing but great infirmities and pressing official duties prevented the late Chief Justice Marshall from preparing a work on the Constitution and Government of the United States for children and young persons, fitted for the Sabbath School libraries of the country, and suited alike to all good citizens, who truly love their country and its institutions.

The acceptance of a dedication implies more or less of approbation. It is an avowal of sympathy between the author and his patron; and, in works dedicated to religion, is regarded as an acknowledgment of general coincidence of views. This being the case, much as we respect Chief Justice Taney, and reverence his office, we are constrained to express our surprise that he would lend the sanction of his name and station to doctrines which, in our judgment, are subversive of all liberty, civil and religious.

This work is divided into twenty-seven chapters, bearing the following titles: "Promise of the Primacy—Institution of the Primacy—Exercise of the Primacy by Peter—Interpretation of the Fathers—Peter, Bishop of Rome—Roman Church—Centre of Unity—Ancient Controversies—Guardianship of Faith—Governing Power—The Hierarchy—Deposition of Bishops—

Appeals—Patrimony of St. Peter—Civil Influence—Umpire—Ecclesiastical Censures—Deposing Power (as used against kings)—Crusades—Inquisition—Papal Prerogatives—Civilization—Literature and the Arts—Succession—Papal Election—Ceremonies—Lives of the Popes.” These several matters are discussed at such length as suited the author. When we began the volume, we thought of a brief review of each chapter. But the subjects presented are too important for that kind of notice. The question, which chapter shall be chiefly noticed, was not very easily answered. After a little reflection, we determined to confine ourselves principally to the twentieth chapter, which treats of the Inquisition. This is one of the long chapters, and is prepared with more care than most of the book. It affords a fair test of the spirit of the author, and brings out his views on a point of great importance. For audacious assertion it has few equals any where. Its attempts to gloss over the foul characters of persecutors are awkward. Its concessions are fatal to popery. We shall prove all these things before we are done, but every thing in its order.

THE INQUISITION, in some form, has long been an engine of Popery. We venture nothing in asserting that, for cold-blooded, systematic and sanctimonious cruelty, it is without a parallel in the history of the world. “Nothing but itself is its parallel.” We have studied this subject with no pleasure, nor do we expect to communicate pleasure to our readers. We promise to throw a veil over all that is improper for our pages. Yet this class of subjects constitutes a great part of the miserable annals of this bloody Moloch. Nor will we needlessly detail any thing of a horrible nature. The maxim, “*afflictio dat intellectum*,” as used by persecutors, is certainly not heavenly, but is at least earthly, and is strongly suspected of being infernal in its origin and spirit. The bible says, that “oppression maketh a wise man mad.” It does not give sobriety or acuteness to the mind. No man’s understanding was ever improved by the injustice, violence and cruelties practiced upon him. No one seriously pretends that during the days of the apostles, or for more than two centuries afterwards, Christians justified any form of persecution for conscience sake. They all maintained the great war with wickedness on the principle asserted by Paul: “The



weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God, to the pulling down of strong holds."

Respecting the Inquisition, we wish to say several things; and that we may not speak confusedly, we arrange them under various and appropriate sections.

What are the principal sources of information, easily accessible on this subject? In reply, we state that the articles on the Inquisition, in our best English Encyclopedias, contain valuable information. Most of our church histories also shed light on this dark and dreary matter. We have also several works on the Inquisition, written by Protestants. Among these we may mention a history of the Inquisition, written by William Sime, and the Ecclesiastical Researches of Claudius Buchanan, who enjoyed great advantages for gaining correct information while residing in the house of the chief Inquisitor at Goa. Besides these, we have the History of the Reformation in Italy, and the History of the Suppression of the Reformation in Spain. The first, third and fourth of these works have been published by the Board of Publication, 265 Chesnut street, Philadelphia, and can easily be procured there, or at their depositories. We hope they will be bought and read. We would specially commend the work of Mr. Sime as the most condensed and the cheapest. But there are other works on the Inquisition of still higher importance, because they are written by those who belonged to the Romish Church. First, there is the *Directorium Inquisitorum*, published at Rome in 1584. It is a large folio, and is indeed a directory. It contains minute directions for the work of wickedness and murder. It is worthy of notice, that Bishop Kenrick never once refers to this work. The reasons of this omission are sufficiently obvious. Very glad would he be if an American Protestant should never see the work. But we have got the work, and we mean to use it. We have also the *Corpus Juris Canonici*, or Body of the Canon Law, another book, which tells minutely when to tease, and fret, and torment mankind. We have also the statements of several men, reared in the Romish church, who were terribly familiar with the principles and practices of this dreadful tribunal. Dellon, a Frenchman, a writer of great perspicuity, once a prisoner of the Inquisition, the accuracy of whose general statements was admitted by the chief Inquisitor of Goa in 1808, has published a

narrative, which has long been well known. Candour and clearness are manifest throughout the work. We have also the statements of Gavin, once a priest in Saragossa, a man whose general good character, while in Spain, was publicly vouched for by Lord Stanhope, and other Englishmen of high character, who had known him in Saragossa, and who, after his flight from his country, was for many years a reputable clergyman in the church of England. We have also the writings of the Rev. Joseph Blanco White, formerly chaplain to the King of Spain, in the Royal Chapel of Seville. All these accounts, written by men once papists, are now in English, and have been, and perhaps still are, for sale in the large book-stores of the country.

But the small work of most importance on this subject, (now printed in English,) is perhaps that of D. Juan Antonio Llorente, who, when he wrote his *History of the Inquisition of Spain*, was an adherent of the church of Rome. He was a knight of the order of Charles III., Chancellor of the University of Toledo, Secretary of the Inquisition at Madrid during the years 1789, 1790, and 1791, and a member of the Royal Academy of History, for which he wrote a work on the Inquisition, which was published by that body. He was also a Counsellor of State to Joseph Buonaparte, when he was King of Spain. That he had no Protestant qualms, nor mawkish sensibility about the mere existence of the Inquisition, but was, by familiarity, dreadfully hardened to its scenes of horror, is evident from the work itself. On the last page of the English translation, (which is also abridged,) he says: "If they would make the proceedings public, and liberate the prisoners on bail, I confess that I should not be afraid to present myself to be tried by that tribunal." He closes with these words: "Since this article was printed, (in the *Gazette de France*, April 3d, 1816,) I have heard that the Inquisitor-general, Mier Campillo, is dead, and that Ferdinand has appointed Monseigneur Jerome Castillon de Salas, Bishop of Taragona, as his successor. God grant that he may understand the spirit of the Gospel, and the necessity of reforming the Inquisition, better than his predecessor." This cannot be called over-nice sensibility. The author does not even denounce the Inquisition. He merely asks that it be "reformed," and made conformable to "the spirit of the Gospel."

We notice this the more particularly, because Bishop Kenrick styles Llorente an "enemy." If he meant that Llorente was an enemy to the doctrines and worship of the Church of Rome, we can only ask, where is the proof? If he intended to produce the impression that Llorente was opposed to the Inquisition in every conceivable shape, as we glory in being, we put Llorente's words, just quoted, to prove the want of candour in the bishop. If he intended to say that Llorente was an "enemy" to the enormous wrongs and cruelties of the Inquisition, then he meant only to say that the Spaniard had still in his heart more justice and humanity after all he had seen and done in the work of cruelty, than has Bishop Kenrick himself.

To this, more than to any other one work, will truthful writers hereafter look for material in giving the history of the Inquisition. Its principles will always be found in the Directory of Inquisitors.

It is proper here to state very briefly the history of the Inquisition. The rise and growth of inquisitorial practices seem to have been contemporaneous with the rise and growth of the Roman papacy, until about the year 1203, when the Pope went regularly to work to establish it, and in A. D. 1208 it was fully organized. Bishop Kenrick admits that "Inquisitors were first appointed by Innocent III.," "at the commencement of the 13th century." He does not speak of him, indeed, as sanguinary, but calls him "this energetic pontiff." As to Guy and Ranier, (or Regnier,) the first Inquisitors, he says they were "charged to inquire diligently after all persons suspected of heresy." We have heard of men being imprisoned in this country on "suspicion of debt;" yet we believe that was only an attempt to be witty; but blessed be God, "suspicion of heresy" is not yet here a crime, for which freemen can be imprisoned. Bishop K. admits that Guy and Ranier "excited the zeal of the civil magistrates to use their authority in repressing the prevailing errors." Bishop, why cannot you speak plainly, and say that Guy and Ranier, your "two Cistercian monks," roused the fanaticism and inflamed the passions of the magistrates to murder unoffending and peaceable men, who had committed no crime?

The first prominent objects of the vengeance of the Inquisition, when fully organized and armed, were that great body of

witnesses of the truth, the Albigenses and Waldenses, of whom their rulers, at the time, acknowledged that they were "all peaceful and submissive subjects." Such was the testimony of the Counts of Toulouse, Foix, Beziers, Cominges, and Carcassone. And such was the number of these innocent people, that the nobles protected them because they saw how their country must, as it were, be depopulated, if these people were persecuted. From this time the Inquisition grew in power till it had strong holds in almost all Popish countries. In Spain it had eighteen distinct tribunals. It also had strong holds in Portugal, and in the Italian States generally; also at Goa, in the East Indies, and in Lima, Carthagena, Mexico, and other places on this continent. It is not easy to say when the Inquisition had obtained its greatest power, or filled the human mind with the extremest terror. It has never been abolished in the Ecclesiastical States. Bishop K. acknowledges this, and says that, "in the Roman States, by the concession of the Pontiff, they (the Supreme Inquisition) can punish by imprisonment, fine, or other civil penalty; but capital punishment cannot be inflicted except by the direct authority of the sovereign himself; and the tribunal has at all times maintained a character of great moderation." p. 341. Here we have three points admitted:—

1. The Inquisition has never been put down by any Pope in his own temporal dominions. He says, "It still subsists."
2. It still puts men in prison for years or for life. The late Bishop of Detroit, if not dead, is thought by many to be still pining away in its dungeons.
3. The Inquisition and Pope united, occasionally put men to death for heresy. At least they may do it; and we know that wolves, having tasted blood, will occasionally seize a sheep or a lamb, even in sight of the fold.

In February, 1813, the General Cortes abolished the Inquisition in Spain, but it was re-established in July, 1814, and has ever since, with slight interruptions, and with diminished resources, been in operation. In 1815, it was in full operation in Mexico; but it there fell at the revolution. It has recently been re-established on the southern part of this continent, greatly to the joy of Romish priests. Its power, however, like that of the Pope, is much less than formerly; but it wields all the power it has, and eagerly grasps at more. In its operations, it is now more quiet and less imposing, but its hated dungeons, its horrible code of judgment



and its secret trials and punishments, still remain wherever Popery has sufficient power to maintain them. Nor can any man foresee when it will be utterly abolished. Bishop K. says: "It had lasted in the kingdom of Arragon for above a century, until the death of Nicholas Eymerick, in 1393." "Upon his death the Inquisition remained in force in that kingdom; but gradually sunk of itself, upon the entire extinction of the Waldenses." In Burgundy, "this tribunal, by degrees, came also to nothing; because, when the Waldenses were extinguished, there were no others for the Inquisition to proceed against." In France generally, "it dropped of itself for want of heresies to proceed against." The Bishop quotes Llorente and Limborch as his authorities. On the above we remark: 1. That the Bishop is getting to be a pretty good witness, unwilling though he be. If we could keep him talking a while, he would do very well. 2. By his own admission, the object of the Inquisitors was the "extinction" of the Waldenses, and they thought they had done it. 3. Our author and Limborch, both, however unintentionally, make a wrong impression when they say that "in France generally, it dropped for want of heresies to proceed against." The Inquisition was never "generally" introduced into France, the French not liking it. Many attempts were made, but it did not gain favorers in the north of France sufficient to support it; and then it is not true that there were not "heresies to proceed against." According to the canon law and Trent, France has always been quite heretical. But power was commonly wanting. That is the true cause of its want of permanency.

We shall next state some of the laws and rules by which the Inquisition was and is governed. From the Directory of Inquisitors, which was published "by consent of the Superiours," "by command of the Cardinals, Inquisitors-General," dedicated to Pope Gregory XIII., and containing his printed approbation of the work, we extract the following:—"All believers in Christ, by the necessity of salvation, are subject to the Roman Pontiff, who carries the sword, temporal and spiritual, and judges all, but is judged by no man." "He is convicted of erring from the faith, who does not reclaim others from error." "He, who retains prohibited books, shall be deemed a favorer of heretics." "The property of heretics shall be confiscated and ap-

plied to the use of the church." "They who bury persons knowing them to be excommunicated, or their receivers, defenders or favorers, shall not be absolved unless they dig up the corpse, and the place shall be deprived of the usual immunities of sepulture." "Statutes, which impede the execution of the duties which appertain to the office of Inquisitors, are null and void." "Inquisitors must discard all fear, and intrepidly proceed against heretical pravity." "He is a heretic who deviates from any article of faith." "A heretic possesses nothing alive or dead." "He is a heretic who does not believe what the Roman Hierarchy teaches. A heretic merits the pains of fire. By the gospel, the canons, civil law and customs, heretics must be burned." "The property of heretics after their death must be seized. No part of their property shall be given to their heirs except for the sake of mercy." "All defence is denied to heretics." "For the suspicion alone of heresy, purification is demanded." "Magistrates, who refuse to take the oath for the defence of the faith, shall be suspected of heresy." "Indulgences for the remission of all sin belong to those, who are signed with the cross for the persecution of heretics." "The Pope can enact new articles of faith. The definitions of Popes and Councils are to be received as infallible." "Every individual may kill a heretic." "All persons may attack any rebels to the church and despoil them of their wealth, and slay them, and burn their houses and cities." "Persons who betray heretics shall be rewarded. But priests, who give the sacrament or burial to heretics, shall be excommunicated." "Prelates are called watchmen, because they persecute heretics." "They, who favour their relatives, who are heretics, shall not, for that cause, receive any milder punishment." "Those, who are subject to a master, or governor, or prince, who has become a heretic, are released from their fidelity, a wife may separate herself from her excommunicated or heretical husband. Children of heretics are discharged from parental authority." "Heretics may be forced to profess the Roman faith." "The testimony of a heretic is admitted on behalf of a Catholic but not against him." "A whole city must be burnt on account of the heretics who live in it. Whoever pleases may seize and kill any heretics." "A person contracting marriage with a heretic, shall be punished, because it is favouring a heretic." "Heretics enjoy

no privileges in law or equity." "Prelates or Inquisitors may torture witnesses." "Heretics persevering in error must be delivered to the secular judge." "He, who does not inform against heretics, shall be deemed as suspected." "He, who contracts marriage twice, shall be deemed as suspected." "He, who marries a person unbaptized, and deserts her to marry a baptized woman, is not guilty of bigamy." "Inquisitors may have a prison for the guilty, and for those who are accused to them, there to be detained or punished." "Prelates and Inquisitors may have a common jail for their prisoners." "Prelates and Inquisitors may put any person to the question by torture." "It is laudable to torture those of every class, who are guilty of heresy." "Inquisitors may lawfully admit perjured persons to testify and act in cases concerning the faith." "Inquisitors may lawfully receive infamous persons and criminals, or servants against their masters both to act and give evidence in causes respecting the faith." "Inquisitors may allow heretics to witness against heretics, but not for them." "Inquisitors may torture witnesses to obtain the truth, and punish them if they have given false evidence." And yet St. Ligorì says it is not mortal sin to tell untruth under torture.

Indeed in the ordinances of 1561, which have ever since been followed in the Spanish Inquisition, it is said (ord. 49) that, "experience has shewn that if he (the accused) is questioned on any subject when pain has reduced him to the last extremity, he will say any thing that is required of him, which may be injurious to other persons, in making them parties concerned, and producing other inconveniences."

But to return to the Directory of Inquisitors. "Inquisitors must not publish the names of informers, witnesses, and accusers." "Penitent heretics may be condemned to perpetual imprisonment." "Prelates ought, without delay, to deliver an impenitent person, guilty of heretical pravity, to the civil authority for the final punishment." "Inquisitors may provide for their own expenditures and the salaries of their officers from the property of heretics." "Inquisitors enjoy the benefits of a plenary indulgence at all times in life and in death."

The foregoing are but a small portion—a mere specimen of the rules laid down for the government of this tribunal. Were it our object to inflame the passions of our readers, we should

be at a great loss for words to characterize the code. But we have no such object in view. We rather wish them to be informed, to become inquirers after truth, and to let their present and future course respecting Popery be guided, not by passion, but by intelligence, sound information and a benevolent spirit. We cannot imagine that reading such documents can fail to excite emotion. Men must be worse than sin commonly makes them, not to feel deeply; humanity stands aghast at such a code of wickedness.

The foregoing rules and decisions are in the "Directory of Inquisitors" followed by the bulls of twenty-three Popes, all breathing the same spirit, and the volume closes with a disquisition by the "Auditor of causes at Rome," "the officer on whose judgment depends the whole code of Papal Morality and Government." In this disquisition he declares that the rules, which have been quoted, and the bulls, which have been referred to, are of "the greatest utility, importance and authority, respecting the duties of Inquisitors of heretical pravity." In the same document he mentions these propositions as infallible truths:

"1. The Roman Pontiffs ever have exercised the greatest care in extirpating heretics. 2. All the decrees published against heretics are in force without change or end. 3. The Roman Pontiffs can command that the secular laws against heretics shall be observed. 4. Justinian coerced the execution of the laws against heretics. 5. The laws against heretics are not abolished through disuse, or lapse of time." These rules and bulls still remain unrepealed. No Pope nor General Council has ever repealed, revoked, repudiated or disowned one of them. Even Bishop Kenrick, bold as he is, does not venture to assert that. They all bind as firmly as ever, where the power to execute them exists. The Council of Trent confirmed all these things by her general adopting clauses. And every Romish priest adopts by a solemn oath the Council of Trent in whole and without mental reservation.

We proceed to notice a remarkable use of terms in the vocabulary of this tribunal. Itself is commonly called the HOLY OFFICE. By the holy office, commonly is understood either that of a minister of Christ, or some work of piety, as that of a child making great sacrifices, or incurring great hazards for a



parent, who is in danger or in sorrow. Some duty, like acts of kindness performed by Christ, might be called, without impropriety a holy office. But if any thing more unholy, less like the holy God, less like the holy angels or holy men, than the Inquisition, has ever existed, historians have not made mention of it. The principles which ruled in the reign of terror in France, were in no respect worse. What do our readers suppose an Inquisitor means by "an act of faith?" Those, who simply read their Bibles and pious books, suppose that by an act of faith is meant the committing of the soul or of some interest to God through Jesus Christ, and commonly under circumstances of trial. Thus a perishing sinner fleeing to Christ, a dying mother committing her babe to the holy keeping of God, and Abraham offering up Isaac, afford striking instances of an act of faith. But in the annals of the Holy Office, an act of faith, "*auto-da-fe*," means a great gathering of Inquisitors, Jesuits, monks, especially Dominicans, Franciscans, and Cistercians, people, and if possible, a prince or two, to see a set of poor, tormented prisoners led forth barefooted through the streets of a large city, in dismal and odious attire, some of it covered over with figures of flaming fire, of dogs, serpents and devils, with open mouths, to a place duly prepared, where some are disgraced in one way and some in another, and commonly some scores of others are roasted, (not burnt in a quick fire but) roasted to death very slowly with priests and Jesuits standing by them and telling them that the devils are waiting to seize their souls. An *auto-da-fe* took place in Mexico as late as December, 1815, and an account of it was published in the Madrid Gazette, of May 14, 1816.

What do our readers suppose an Inquisitor means by a House of Mercy? Surely we shall have something good now, something where ministers of mercy bind up the wounded, feed the hungry, clothe the naked, nurse the sick. No! a house of mercy in the vocabulary of the Holy Office, is a horrible prison, divided into little, low, damp and dark cells, commonly under ground, no inmate having permission to speak even to a fellow-prisoner, without books, without comforts. Bishop K. quotes Puigblanch as complaining that the cells were not well-furnished. "No other furniture is allowed in the cells of the prisoner than a wooden bedstead, clamped down, or built in

masonry, a table, one chair." Our American Bishop with the utmost *sang froid* dismisses the complaint with these words: "Perhaps this will not appear to others a just subject of complaint." And the kind bishop tells us on the same page (348) "that when the criminal bears with impatience the misfortune and infamy of his imprisonment, in such case the Inquisitor must endeavour to comfort him very often." Might not the poor prisoner in such case, without sinful impatience, say as Job, "Miserable comforters are ye all." Those shut up in these cells are put there for trial, for three years, for eight years, for life, or for an *auto-da-fe*. Our author says: "The sentence of perpetual imprisonment was reduced to three years in favour of penitents. When the sentence excluded the hope of pardon, *absque spe gratiæ*, it was still limited to eight years on repentance." He also tells us that poor Jerome Vecchietti having been imprisoned five years "was restored to his friends, on some appearance of weakness of mind." Bishop, why did not you candidly say that the cruelties of the Inquisition made him a mad-man and then an idiot?

Since our childhood relaxation has been to us a pleasant word. In our minds it is associated with childish plays, with little excursions, with cessation of toil and with the society of friends. But in the glossary of the Inquisition relaxation means being placed in a hideous dress on the top of a post ten feet from the ground, and a fire kindled at the foot of the post and kept burning until the skin bursts open and the juices of the human body drop down, and at last life is extinct. This is relaxation.

To put one to the question is to us not alarming. It sounds awkwardly to be sure. We suppose it means to put the question to one. Whether a man says that he hitched the horse to the cart, or hitched the cart to the horse, we still understand the same thing. But to put one to the question in Inquisitorial language means to torture a man or woman, when no questions are asked. For in the 49th of the Madrid Ordinances it is specially provided that "after it (the question or torture) has been decided on, he (the accused) shall not be examined on any particular fact; he shall be allowed to say what he pleases." We shall not attempt a description of the various modes of torture. It would harrow up the feelings of our readers, or send them to

a sleepless bed. We shall only attempt to give some idea of the thing. One mode of torture was to lift the tortured several feet from the ground by ropes fastened to the body or limbs and attached to machinery, and then suddenly let them drop until they nearly reached the ground, and then, having the ropes fastened, suddenly check the fall and wrench every joint and muscle. Llorente, giving an account of the auto-da-fe at Seville in the year 1560, concludes the chapter with this paragraph; "Donna Jane Bohorques was (at this burning) declared innocent, she was the legitimate daughter of Don Pedro Garcia de Xeresey Bohorques, and the sister of Donna Maria Bohorques, who perished in a former auto-da-fe. She had married Don Francis de Vargas, Lord of the borough of Hiquera. She was taken to the secret prisons, when her unfortunate sister declared that she (Jane) was acquainted with her (Maria's) opinions, and had not opposed them; as if silence could prove that she admitted the doctrine (of Luther) to be true. Jane Bohorques was six months gone with child, but this did not prevent the Inquisitors from proceeding in her trial, a cruelty which will not surprise, when it is considered that she was arrested before any proof of her crime had been obtained. She was delivered in the prison; her child was taken from her at end of eight days, in defiance of the most sacred rights of nature, and she was imprisoned in one of the common dungeons of the Holy Office. The Inquisitors thought they did all that humanity required in giving her a less inconvenient cell than the common prison. It fortunately happened that she had as a companion in her cell a young girl, who was afterwards burnt as a Lutheran, and who, pitying her situation, treated her with the utmost tenderness during her convalescence. She (the girl) soon required the same care; she was tortured, and all her limbs were bruised, and almost dislocated. Jane Bohorques attended her in this dreadful state. Jane Bohorques was not yet quite recovered, when she was tortured in the same manner. The cords, with which her still feeble limbs were bound, penetrated to the bone, and several blood-vessels breaking in her body, torrents of blood flowed from her mouth. She was taken back to her dungeon in a dying state, and expired a few days after. The Inquisitors thought they expiated this cruel murder by declaring Jane Bohorques innocent in the auto-da-fe of this

day." p 85. This is the testimony of a man, who on the same page declares that he "was not less attached to the Catholic church than any Inquisitor might be." This is the institution of which Bishop Kenrick (p. 347) says: "No circumstances of cruelty attended it" (torture,) and adds: "The prisoners were generally treated with great humanity and indulgence."

Another mode of torture was to stretch the accused on the wheel. Never having seen the process, and not having at hand an account of it, we cannot say certainly that this was it, but we will venture to say, relying on memory, that it was this or something as bad. A human being was taken and his hands and feet were drawn with force to four points on a wheel, as remote from each other as they could be (a posture of extreme pain,) and then made fast with cords. Then the wheel was turned rapidly round, and when the wheel stopped, the sufferers body and head and arms being heavier than the legs, the head, was downwards.

Another method of torture was wrapping cords several times around the body or limbs, and with a powerful machine tightening them until life was nearly gone. To this was added the Chevalet, Llorente (pp. 49, 50) says: "At Valladolid on the 21st of June 1527, the licentiate Moriz, inquisitor, caused the licentiate Juan de Salas, to appear before him, and the sentence was read and notified to him. After the reading, the said licentiate Salas declared, that he had not said that of which he was accused; and the said licentiate Moriz immediately caused him to be conducted to the chamber of torture, where being stripped to his shirt, Salas was put by the shoulders into the chevalet, where the executioner, Pedro Parras, fastened him by the arms and legs with cords of hemp, of which he made eleven twines around each limb; Salas, during the time that the said Pedro was tying him thus, was warned several times to speak the truth, to which he always replied, that he had never said what he was accused of. He recited the creed, "*Quicumque vult,*" and several times gave thanks to God and our Lady; and the said Salas being still tied as before mentioned, a fine wet cloth was put over his face, and about a pint of water was poured into his mouth and nostrils, from an earthen vessel with a hole at the bottom, and containing about two quarts; nevertheless, Salas still persisted in denying the accusation. Then Pedro de



Porras tightened the cords on the right leg, and poured a second measure of water on the face: the cords were tightened a second time on the same leg, but Juan de Salas still persisted in denying that he ever said any thing of the kind; and although several times pressed to tell the truth, he still denied the accusation. Then the said licentiate Moriz, having declared that the torture was begun but not finished, commanded that it should cease. The accused was withdrawn from the chevalet at which execution, I, Henry Paz, was present from the beginning to the end. Henry Paz, Notary."

Yet Salas was innocent of any crime proven; but on account of "suspicion arising from the trial," he was condemned to the auto-da-fe, "in his shirt, without a cloak, his head uncovered, and with a torch in his hand; that he should abjure heresy publicly, pay to the Inquisition ten ducats of gold, and fulfil his penance in the church assigned."

Perhaps the most favourite and refined mode of torturing, was by the use of an image of the Virgin Mary, so made as to embrace the miserable victim with a squeeze as he, at the bidding of an official, kissed it; and it pierced him terribly. "When the vaults of the Spanish Inquisition were thrown open by the troops of Napoleon, an image of the Virgin Mary was discovered, which, on inspection, was found to be a torturing engine. She wore beneath her robes a metal breast-plate, thickly stuck with needles, spikes, and lancets. The familiar, who was present, was requested to work the engine, and he did so. As she raised her arms, as if to embrace, a knapsack was thrown into them, and in closing upon it, she pierced it through in a hundred places. To the living victim it would have proved instantly the embrace of death." This was probably the most exquisite of all tortures. Yet Bishop Kenrick says: "It is easy to draw pictures of culprits, stretched on the rack, suspended by pulleys, or otherwise tortured; but facts do not sustain these representations." But, Bishop, there are many living witnesses, who saw these things in Spain with their own eyes. Some of them reside in this country. One of them, who was a Colonel in Buonaparte's army, and whose regiment destroyed one or more of these torment houses, is now an honored minister of the gospel in the Lutheran Church in the United States, and has often described these things to the people of this country.

The Directory of Inquisitors says: "There are five degrees of torture; or, as Paul Grillandus writes, fourteen species of torture." It also declares that "common fame and one witness are sufficient to justify the torture;" again, "Common fame alone, or one witness alone, authorizes the torture;" and again, "Extra-judicial confession, which is reiterated under torture, must be considered as a ratification." The Inquisition has also secret modes of intentionally putting to death, as well as of torturing men and women to make them accuse themselves or others. They bake in the dry pan, and they destroy life by throwing the victim into pits filled with toads and serpents. When the Inquisition was thrown open by order of the Cortes of Madrid, "twenty-one prisoners were found in it, not one of whom knew the name of the city in which he was. Some had been confined three years, some a longer period, and not one knew perfectly the nature of the crime of which he was accused. One of these prisoners had been condemned, and was to have suffered on the following day. His punishment was to be death by the pendulum. The method of thus destroying the victim was as follows: the condemned is fastened in a groove, upon a table, on his back; suspended above him is a pendulum, the edge of which is sharp, and it is so constructed as to become longer with every movement. The wretched victim sees this implement of destruction swinging to and fro above him, and every moment the keen edge approaching nearer and nearer; at length it cuts the skin of his nose, and gradually cuts on until life is extinct. It may be doubted if the holy office, in its mercy, ever invented a more humane and rapid method of exterminating heresy, or ensuring confiscation. This, let it be remembered, was a punishment of the Secret Tribunal, A. D. 1820." (Llorente, p. 6 of the Preface.)

We proceed to notice the crimes of which the Holy Office took cognizance. These were indeed all summed up under the the general term, heresy; but that term was made very comprehensive, and extended not only to all possible supposed errors in religion, but also to those of philosophy, natural and moral, to the science of government, to literature, &c. The classes of persons tried were four: 1. those slightly suspected; 2, those seriously suspected; 3, those violently suspected; 4, those convicted either by confession with or without torture, or

by witnesses unknown to the accused. The crimes of which the Inquisitors took cognizance, were every thing that their superstitious authorities chose to define as blasphemy; also sorcery, divination, baptizing a dead person, re-baptizing an infant, making use in sorcery of holy water, of the host or of consecrated oil; the invocation of demons, remaining a year excommunicated, denying the supremacy or authority of the Pope, and opposing, in any way, the Inquisition. Schism was another high offence, either with or without heresy. The concealers, favourers, or adherents of heretics were duly noticed also. Nobles, who had a hereditary attachment to their peasants, and declined to take an oath to drive heretics from their estates, —magistrates, lawyers, notaries, &c. &c., who failed to aid in denouncing, discovering, or exposing heretics, were regarded as suspected. Upon the poor Jews the storm was every where dreadful, and especially in Spain. Llorente says: "Facts prove, beyond a doubt, that the extirpation of Judaism was not the real cause, but the mere pretext for the establishment of the Inquisition by Ferdinand V. The true motive was to carry on a vigorous system of persecution against the Jews, and so bring their riches into the hands of government." "The immense trade carried on by the Jews had thrown into their hands the greatest part of the wealth of the peninsula, and they had acquired great power and influence in Castile and Arragon." A converted Jew was considered as relapsed into heresy, if he kept the Sabbath out of respect to the law, which he had abandoned. This was sufficiently proved if he wore better linen and garments on that day than those which he commonly used, or had not a fire in his house from the preceding evening; if he took the suet and fat from the animals which were intended for his food, and washed the blood from it; if he examined the blade of the knife before he killed the animals, and covered the blood with earth; if he blessed the table after the manner of the Jews; if he pronounced the bakara, or benediction, when he took the cup into his hands, and pronounced certain words before he gave it to another person; if he recited the Psalms of David without repeating the Gloria Patri at the end; if he gave his son a Hebrew name chosen from among those used by the Jews; if he plunged him, seven days after his birth, into a basin containing water, gold, silver, seed-pearl, wheat, barley,

and other substances; pronouncing, at the same time, certain words according to the custom of the Jews; if he performed the ruaya, a ceremony, which consisted in inviting his relations and friends to a repast the day before he undertook a journey; if he turned his face to the wall at the time of his death, or had been placed in that posture before he expired; if he washed, or caused to be washed in hot water, the body of a dead person, and interred him in a new shroud, with hose, shirt, and a mantle, and placed a piece of money in his mouth; if he uttered a discourse in praise of the dead, or recited melancholy verses; if he emptied the pitchers, and other vessels of water, in the house of the dead person, or in those of his neighbours; if he sat behind the door of the deceased as a sign of grief, or ate fish and olives instead of meat, to honour his memory; or if he remained in his house one year after the death of any person, to prove his grief." pp. 5, 19, 20.

Thus the "New Christians," for so Jews baptized, even by compulsion, were called—were hunted, and fretted, and put to death. Their table, their nurseries, their dying pillow, were snares. Those who would, under no threats and pains, consent to be baptized, were, in 1492, ordered to leave the kingdom. They might sell their stock, and carry away their furniture, but they were not allowed to carry away gold or silver. Andrew Bernaldez, in his *History of the Catholic Kings*, says that he knew of Jews giving a house for an ass, and a vineyard for a small quantity of cloth or linen. Mariana says that eight hundred thousand Jews quitted Spain at this time. "In 1530, the Pope gave the Inquisitor-general the necessary power to absolve all the Moors of Arragon as often as they should relapse into heresy and repent, without inflicting any public penance or infamous punishments. The motives expressed in the bull for this course were, that they were much sooner converted by gentle means than severity. It is natural to inquire why a different policy was adopted with respect to the Jews?" Llorente, p. 41. The answer is, the Jews were generally rich merchants, and the Moors were generally poor. Confiscation towards Jews would greatly enrich inquisitors and tyrants; but towards the Moors it would be very unproductive.

The Inquisitors seem always to have had a great abhorrence of learning and of learned men. Greek and Hebrew they par-



ticularly hated. Nothing was a surer introduction to the dungeons than to intimate that the Vulgate did not in all things tally with the Greek and Hebrew text. "Juan de Vergara was a canon of Toledo, and had been secretary to Cardinal Ximenes de Cisneros, and to Don Alphonso de Fronseca, his successor in the see of that city. His profound knowledge of the Greek and Hebrew languages was the cause of his misfortune; he had remarked some faults in the translation of the Vulgate, and thus gave the signal for persecution to some monks, who had only studied Latin and the jargon of the schools." His brother, Bernardin de Tobar, was also arrested. John Louis Vives, writing to Erasmus, says: "We live in a difficult time; it is dangerous either to speak or be silent. Vergara, his brother, Bernardin de Tobar, and several other learned men, have been arrested in Spain." Alphonzo Virues, one of the best scholars, especially in oriental languages, and preacher to Charles V., was also seized. All these men were cruelly imprisoned; yet Virues was by the Pope himself afterwards made a Bishop. All learning seems to have been very odious to the Holy Office. The Colloquies of Erasmus, his Eulogy of Folly, and his Paraphrase, were put under the ban. Bibles, in the common language of the people, seem always to have been very liable to be condemned and burnt. A Spanish Bible was a monster in the eyes of the Holy Office. Perez del Prado said: "That some individuals had carried their audacity to the execrable extremity of demanding permission to read the Holy Scriptures in the vulgar tongue, without fearing to encounter mortal poison therein." "The Inquisition also prohibited pictures, medals, prints, and a number of other things with as much severity as books. Thus fans, snuff-boxes, mirrors, and other articles of furniture, were often the cause of great troubles and difficulties to those who possessed them, if they happened to be adorned with mythological figures, which might be considered as indecent." The greatest charge against any man was opposition to popish dogmas. Thus, if a man said it was not sinful to eat meat on Friday, in Lent, or on other fast-days, or that God did not establish the religious orders, or that faith and baptism are sufficient to salvation, or that Lutherans will be saved, he was undone. Llorente, pp. 27, 41, 43, 46, 47. The Supreme Inquisition has prohibited the reading of the works of Lord Bacon,

Chief Justice Hale, John Locke, Milton, Addison, Cowper, Young, Algernon Sidney, Robertson, and nearly every book of high value in English Literature. It does still prohibit them without permission from a priest. Many abstained from the perusal of such works, to avoid a disputatious, temper-provoked persecution. At one time, for a Spaniard to sell horses to a Frenchman, brought on suspicion of heresy and imprisonment. Smuggling was duly noticed by the Holy Office. Rising merit was a great offence. Writing against the Jesuits was a crime. Writing a good treatise on mathematics brought on Bails the charge of materialism and atheism. To write a truthful history of one's country, to write a poem, with the usual poetical license, to translate Buffon, or to express belief in the Newtonian system of astronomy, was ground of imprisonment and disgrace. Any act of hospitality to a suspected person was a great offence. Learning in any shape was peculiarly odious, unless it were perverted to purposes of superstition. The whole world knows how Galileo was imprisoned, and how cruelly he was treated for asserting that the world turns round. When John Quincy Adams alluded to this fact, in his address at the laying of the foundation of the Cincinnati Observatory, a writer, said to be Bishop Purcell, expressed great indignation. We read the paper at the time, but have not a copy at hand, so as to be able to say exactly how far he went in denial. But Bishop Kenrick has noticed Galileo's imprisonment by the Inquisition (p. 346) in these words: "In all cases of importance, the process was formed with the assistance of an advocate; and where the accused was of considerable standing in society, the assessor of the tribunal, and personages of high rank intervened, as in the cases of De Dominis and Galileo." It seems, then, that Galileo was imprisoned, as Bishop Kenrick admits. Nor does he intimate, nor dare he say that Galileo was charged with any other heresy than this:—the earth revolves on its own axis. Paschal, in the 18th of his Provincial Letters, addressing Father Annat, Jesuit, says: "In vain did you obtain a decree from Rome against Galileo, which condemned his opinion respecting the motion of the earth. This will never prove that it stands still; and if it has been ascertained, from careful observations, that it turns, all mankind together cannot prevent its turning, nor prevent their being carried round with it. Do not imagine

that the letters of Pope Zachary, for the excommunication of St. Virgil for asserting we had antipodes, have annihilated that new world, though he declared this opinion to be a dangerous error."

The number of victims, who fell under the cruelties of the Inquisition cannot now be ascertained. In some cases the Inquisitors became crusaders, as against the Albigenses and Waldenses, and, in field fighting, sieges, and sacking and burning cities and towns, murdered thousands upon thousands. Bishop Kenrick says that "the number of persons who have suffered death in consequence of conviction before the Inquisition, although not by the act of its officers, cannot be ascertained." Yet he says: "We may hope that the number of those who suffered is far less than a tithe of what has been alleged." The Inquisitors are justly accountable for all the assassinations, murders, civil wars and wars of extermination, which their principles, preaching and practices brought forth no less than for the deaths caused by their tortures, by their dungeons and in their *autos-da-fe*. How many too must have died of terror, of a broken heart and of madness in countries where so iron a rod was held over the people, and where when a family separated at night, it was not certain that they would ever see each other again. Although we cannot give exact numbers, yet we have data for reasonable conjectures. Llorente, whose opinion on one point Bishop Kenrick quotes as the foundation of the "hope," expressed above, says: "The horrid conduct of the holy office weakened the power and diminished the population of Spain by arresting the progress of arts, sciences, industry and commerce, and by compelling multitudes of families to abandon the kingdom; by instigating the expulsion of the Jews and Moors; and by immolating on its flaming piles more than three hundred thousand victims." Preface p. 5. In the last three pages of his work he gives various facts and records, on which rests his estimate of the number of victims at 300,000. Those, who were burned in effigy, only saved their lives by flight and suffered confiscation. In 1481 two thousand were condemned to relaxation (burning) by the Inquisitors of Seville, and there were many effigies. One thousand seven hundred persons were reconciled. The Inquisition was once established in the Navy of Spain.

Salgado, who was as far from being a Protestant as any man in America, speaking of Inquisitors, says. "Three things they are notoriously busy about. 1. They murder fellow-subjects and damn their souls. 2. They rob families and leave them to poverty and shame. 3. They scatter the people and drive them out of the kingdom; where they seize one, many run away from their cruelty, and leave their own country desolate. In three things they are more unjust than heathens. 1. Concealing of accusers. 2. Present spoiling of goods. 3. Secret prisons. In three things they act like idolaters. 1. Expecting a veneration becoming saints, while they are devils incarnate. 2. Concerning the ignominious *san-benito* (yellow shirt for convicts in the *auto-da-fe*) making it a sacred vestment. 3. Placing them with the images of their saints in their churches. In three things they act like the devil. 1. They have a prison like hell itself. 2. Familiars like fiends. 3. Torments that exceed the power of any to bear them and live. They are the worst of tyrants, in three things. 1. Forbidding all converse with any; nay, stripping them (the prisoners's) wives of their bracelets and ear-rings. 2. They are both enemies to their persons, and judges of their cause, from whom no appeal is permitted. 3. All they do against innocents is justified with this, "The Inquisition hath done it, and since (pleased them,) it must not be complained of. They are savage as the most barbarous, without respect to sex; women are badly treated by them, virgins shamefully beaten, prisoners starved, and their debts not paid out of their estates confiscated. This is the true temper of these Inquisitors; they are made up of what is worst in barbarous, tyrannical, idolatrous, heathenish, and diabolical tempers. The particular view of this court of blood casts me into an amazement, that a king, with such counsellors as assist the Spanish king, should suffer so tyrannical and cruel a power, which without much noise, and without any justice, hath eaten out the glory, strength, and vanity of that monarchy, and like a fretting moth, hath marred all that was the beauty of it."

Bishop Kenrick seems to have had this passage of Salgado, or one like it in some other author in his mind, when he wrote the following (pp. 337. 338) "Ferdinand conceived, that by means of an ecclesiastical tribunal" (the holy office) "the dissimulation of false professors could be discovered, and many



might be gained over by mild persuasions ; and that the fear of royal vengeance would deter others from returning in secret to the superstitions, which they had abjured. The event proved that his policy was correct, since, by the aid of the Inquisition, the integrity of Catholic faith was maintained, and the contrary errors rapidly disappeared. The strength of the monarchy grew with the unity of national belief, and the glory of Spain in literature, as well as in arms and enterprise, spread abroad in the reigns of Ferdinand, Charles V. and Philip II., which is admitted by the enemies of the institution to have been the golden age of the Spanish nation." So it was but other things than priestcraft and murder were the causes. The opening of the mines of the new world, the spring to commerce given by Spanish colonies, the revival of letters in countries north of Spain, and the military skill of a few eminent Spaniards were the leading causes of the rise of Spain. These causes held her up for a time, notwithstanding the Inquisition and the superstitions of her clergy and people. Indeed, Bishop K.'s very next words are: "I do not claim for the Inquisition the praise of these results, which I advert to, merely with a view to silence an oft-repeated calumny, that it crushed the energies and blunted the faculties of the Spaniards and of every other people among whom it was enacted." The above sentences are peculiar to our author, and a set of men, who, having a bad cause wishing to say something, and not knowing exactly what to say, say contradictory things. He says, 1. Ferdinand's policy was correct. 2. The praise is not due to the Inquisition, which was his policy. 3. The Bishop wishes to silence a calumny by what he admits had no part in producing good results. The truth is that such were the prodigious advantages of Spain for a while, that had the Inquisition imprisoned half the people, she would still have been a splendid kingdom, but these causes were temporary. Superstition and the Inquisition were permanent causes, and wrought the prostration of Spain. Bishop K. admits that the Inquisition was not put down in Spain till some time after the commencement of the nineteenth century, (p. 342.) Where is the glory of Spain now?

The reader is now prepared for some extended notice of the Bishop's views of the Inquisition. We are not sure that we

understand them fully. But we engage not to make anything of doubtful import by the manner of quoting it. We will first notice some of his admissions. He admits throughout this chapter that there was an institution called the Inquisition, that the popes erected, sanctioned, and controlled it, made its laws, and appointed and removed Inquisitors, that "by abandoning the convict to the secular power, the Pope virtually sanctioned the legal punishment." (p. 331). On the same page he says: "It were vain to deny that the Popes, in appointing Inquisitors, had ultimately in view to suppress heresy by the aid of the civil power, when milder means had proved unsuccessful, and that they exhorted, and, by ecclesiastical censures, compelled princes to put in execution coercive laws." On p. 333 he admits that "Inquisitors handed over apostates to the civil power" and that they, "during a long period were members of religious orders;" and on p. 334, that the Emperor Frederick II., in the 13th century "decreed that the sentence of Inquisitors should be final," and "that manichees should be delivered to the flames. This act of the Emperor surrounded the Inquisition with those terrific attributes, which cause it to be regarded with so much horror." He also admits that in Lombardy from 1238 the Friars were Inquisitors: On page 335 he says that "from the chief matter of its cognizance, which is heresy, and from the character of the judges, it is plainly an ecclesiastical tribunal," that it was only by complying with the invitation of Inquisitors to accuse themselves, that men "were exempt from capital punishment, perpetual imprisonment, banishment, and confiscation of property," that "if they" [the accused] "could not rebut the charge, a sentence of condemnation followed," and that "such as were not imprisoned, were to enlist for a time in the crusades, and on Sundays and festivals to appear in church in the garb of penitents." On p. 336 he says: "Heretics condemned to death or perpetual imprisonment forfeited their property to the public treasury," and that "although no one suffered death by the decree of the Inquisitors, it cannot be questioned that many, convicted by their sentence, perished in the flames by the action of the civil authority; and the odium of these executions is necessarily shared by them." On pp. 341-2 he says that "the Pope, whose office as guardian of the faith constitutes him Supreme Inquisitor, presides (in the Supreme Inquisition) when

causes of high importance are under consideration, and decides them, with the advice of the council." On p. 343 he admits "the secrecy observed in this tribunal," and says it "was intended to prevent the loss of character, if the accused should be acquitted, or should abjure his errors, and to avoid excitement, and secure the ends of justice." "The ends of justice secured" by not letting a man know who his accusers were. On the same page he admits that "all the officers of the Inquisition and the accuser, culprit, witnesses and advocate were bound to secrecy." On the next page he says that "the day, and precise hour or room might be omitted" (in the process) "if these particulars were likely to lead to the discovery of the informant," and on the next, that "the solemnities of public trials were omitted, and the trial was summary and informal," and that if the accused "denied" the general charge, "the specific charge was communicated, without revealing his accuser." On pp. 346, 347, he admits that the rack was used, that the use of it "was borrowed from the ancient Greeks and Romans," and that "it was resorted to where strong presumptive evidence of heinous guilt had been received," and says, it was confined to such cases. The reader can look at the case of Jane Bohorques, and at hundreds of others, and see the exception here made is not sustained. He also says: "The threat of torture was frequently used without its actual application," and refers to Limborch for proof. Fine work this for priors, Dominicans, Franciscans, Cisterians, and Bishops to threaten people with the torture. He admits that one or more Inquisitors were present when the accused was tortured. He says that the Popes "gave prompt redress when any abuse came to their knowledge." We might ask what redress was sufficiently prompt, when the man was dead or his constitution destroyed? Besides, how was any abuse to come to his knowledge? The whole affair was in secret, and every one, culprit included, sworn to secrecy? On page 350 he quotes with approbation Macanaz as asserting that the torture was not applied until "after condemnation." But every body knows that this was not true. The Bishop himself has before admitted that it was applied where "strong presumptive proof" existed. But suppose a man condemned to death. Why torture him?

The foregoing admissions of Bishop K. are enough to brand

the Inquisitors, their bailiffs, their code, their favourers, their patrons, the Popes, with the blackest infamy forever. He is an enemy of human freedom and of man, who does not say so. Had Bishop K. said so, we should have felt that he at least loved his race and rejoiced in their happiness. But instead of this or any thing like it he becomes the apologist for these horrible men and their horrible practices. With him Innocent III. is an "energetic Pontiff," (p. 331) and on page 228, he speaks with perfect coolness of "the strong arm of Cæsar Borgia crushing the high pretensions of the princes or barons." His first defence, or excuse, or apology is (p. 331) that the Inquisitors "did not pronounce sentence of death." Yet he has admitted that their sentence was final. Then they delivered men up to be put to death without sentence! It is true, however, that the Inquisition, by its officers, arrested, put in jail, tortured, tried, pronounced something called "condemnation" by Bishop K., and the civil government came in and acted as hangman or rather burner. Suppose the prince had not declared heresy a crime, the Inquisitors would have told the Pope, and the Pope would have denounced "ecclesiastical censures" on him as the bishop has admitted. Then his kingdom would have been taken from him, unless he had repented and helped to exterminate heretics. If any subordinate magistrate had refused his aid, he would soon have found himself in the jail of the Inquisition, as one "suspected of heresy." We know, all the world knows that the Pope ruled princes and people. "He exalted himself above all that is called God." Besides, who were the princes that passed and executed these cruel laws but those who held the Pope's stirrup when he went to mount his horse, or kissed his toe when they came into his presence? The truth is this; no body of men on earth ever had an institution like the Inquisition but the Pope and Church of Rome and their adherents. Among them they have managed to murder hundreds of thousands of peaceable people. There the burden rests, nor can any thing remove this just charge. The second excuse is that "the Fiscal Promoter, that is the prosecuting officer must swear that none of the heads of accusation proceeds from a malicious design." (p. 334.) On this we observe that this officer is very well named Fiscal Promoter. It was his duty to promote the income by confiscations. Oaths



of office are but slight in their influence over bad men, whose trade is crime and cruelty. The Jesuit confessors could easily furnish a distinction between a "malicious design" and a covetous motive. So that if he did not hate a man outright, yet if he wanted his money, that was enough. And the informer might be malicious and the Fiscal Promoter not know it. As all was secret, there was no chance to prove malice, unless your enemy had been openly malicious, and you could guess who accused you. We have already noticed perhaps another apology on page 347, though for another purpose. It is that, "the threat of torture was frequently used, without its actual application." The reader must make his own comments on this. Another statement (p. 348,) is that the sick in the dungeons were allowed "a surgeon and physician, and the dying a confessor." What kind people. Yet Bishop K. on the previous page puts a note of admiration (!) to the sentence, in which he informs us that "some in the prison at Madrid complained to the Pope, as of a great privation, that a priest was not sent to celebrate mass for them!" But says the Bishop, (p. 349,) "the sentence of the Inquisition in the worst cases was to abandon the convict to the civil power, which was accompanied by a recommendation of mercy." Yet the Bishop knows, as well as we do, that this recommendation of mercy was a mere form, that it was made in all cases, and granted in none. Indeed the Bishop immediately adds: "This abandonment was made with a knowledge that the laws enjoined death for the crime, but the expression of the ecclesiastical judge was intended to show the reluctance with which the church beholds the shedding of human blood, according to the known maxim: *Ecclesia abhorret a sanguine.*" It seems then it was all "intended for show," and not to save life. The prince who should have pardoned one condemned to relaxation, would have found himself very speedily in bad odour with the Pope. Bishop K. knows this; all reading men know it. But says the Bishop, (p. 351,) "It is just to take into consideration the outrages and civil wars which have been prevented by the Inquisition." Yet he cannot show, because none but God knows what would have been, if there had been no Inquisition. He says as much himself. For when he comes to tell us what mighty mischiefs would have happened to Spain and Italy in the sixteenth century but for the holy office, de-

cency compels him to qualify it with a "probably." So that plea is "probably" good for nothing. Indeed the Bishop had just before quoted Llorente as acknowledging that the severity of the Inquisition abated in the fourteenth century. How it could do much in the sixteenth century then, he does not tell us. Besides, the Bishop does not seem to think this a very good way of reasoning, and we agree with him. He soon adds: "The prevention of calamities the most direful cannot, indeed, justify a law, which creates an imaginary offence; but heresy was not in former ages a mere error of the mind." Even that assertion is, if possible, surpassed by the last sentence of a paragraph on page 353. "The mercy of the Inquisition to penitent convicts is without parallel in any other tribunal." But says Bishop K., on the same page, "the general esteem in which the tribunal was held, does not suffer us to suppose that it was generally unjust or cruel. It was deemed a high honour to be numbered among its familiars or bailiffs. No one dares oppose the executor. If any one should, the mob would immediately run together to lend a helping hand," &c. Does the Bishop mean to say that an ignorant, priest-ridden mob, who hate men of standing and wealth, and who see an engine for pulling down the great to their own level, are good judges of what is unjust or cruel? As to the "general esteem," in which it was held, it is enough to say that it drove millions of people out of Spain, and sent three hundred thousand to eternity, and confiscated their estates.

The following sentences we forbear to characterize. They are so foreign from historical verity, that we simply quote them: "The Inquisition is not directed to the punishment of heretics, but rather to their conversion," (p. 329.) "It will be found on examination that it was generally in cases where the order of society was disturbed by acts of violence the severity of those times was exercised," (p. 332.) "The great and distinctive characteristic of the Inquisition, as an ecclesiastical tribunal, was its endeavour to reclaim heretics by persuasion and the assurance of pardon." "Avowed heretics were to be secretly examined in presence of a select number of prudent Catholics, and by mildness induced to abjure their errors," (p. 335.) "Every extenuating circumstance was brought forward, every motive for doubt was alleged, every thing unfavourable to the accuser,

and favourable to the accused was considered; and if the evidence were not altogether conclusive, time was taken for further inquiry," (p. 343.) "Cavils and mere technicalities had no place in the process, but facts and justice were always held in view," (p. 345.) "The accused was encouraged to defend himself freely." "The advocate aided the prisoner by his advice, and undertook his defence sincerely and earnestly." "Full liberty of conversing (with the advocate) and writing was allowed." "The process was conducted with the strictest regard to truth: the most patient attention was given to every circumstance that could militate in behalf of the accused; and conviction followed only when all doubt of guilt had vanished," (p. 346.)

The Bishop certainly undertook a very difficult work when he engaged to excuse the Inquisition. On page 337, he asserts that "the Inquisition itself, as a permanent and organized tribunal, scarcely existed before the close of the fifteenth century." On page 331 he admits that Inquisitors were appointed by Innocent III. and we know from the Bishop's own catalogue of the Popes, given at the end of his book, that Innocent III. sat from the 8th of January, 1198, until the 16th of July, 1216, yet to contradict both of these assertions, he has told us on page 350, that the severity of the Inquisition abated in the fourteenth century. How are these statements to be reconciled?

But the Bishop now and then waxes bold. He tells us on page 340 of the wonderful effects of force in converting men's souls. He says: "Many, no doubt, will deny the right of influencing religious opinions by allurements, or by terror, and will be disposed to regard the conformity produced in either way, as superficial and illusive; but as St. Augustine, in his day, testified that whole cities, Hippo among others, had passed sincerely from Donatism to the profession of the Catholic faith, under the terror of the Cæsarean laws, so history records the sincere and lasting conversion of thousands, who were terrified by the fear of civil punishment, and won by the proffer of pardon. Thirty thousand obtained pardon in Andalusia within the space of forty years, from 1481 to 1520, by availing themselves of the time of grace, and spontaneously abjuring their errors."

The following are specimens of ghostly whining which we have seldom seen equalled. He says: "The most beautiful

examples of a Christian spirit have been left by several of the Inquisitors. He then tells the story of St. Peter *de Castro novo*, and of St. Peter of Verona, two most furious and fanatical Inquisitors, who fell by the hand of assassins, one of whom dying prayed for his murderer, and the other dying recited the Apostles' creed. These are the chief proofs of their wonderful piety. pp. 333 334. But says the Bishop, "The Inquisitor and Counsellors began the examination (of the accused) with solemn prayer on bended knees, using the same formulary as is prescribed for the councils: '*Adsumus Domine*,' asking that in nothing they might deviate from the truth, but in all things preserve justice moderated by piety." p. 345. Such forms of devotion, when used to gloss over with a show of sanctity, the most cruel conduct, only serve to enhance its atrocity. After all this, our readers may be surprised to see the Bishop saying, on page 336, "For my own part, I am horrified with these awful exhibitions, whatever occasion may have been offered for them by the unhappy sufferers." The Bishop is horrified! but where does he put the blame? is the main question. So far as he puts it anywhere he puts it upon the "unhappy sufferers." On page 339 he waxes a little more bold and says, "that the religious unity and civil concord which the Inquisition maintained, were the panegyrics of national writers, during the whole period of its existence, and St. Theresa and St. Ignatius, of Loyola, and other holy persons, commended its influence and results. It rose with the Spanish monarchy, and gave it strength and durability; it fell by the act of a foreign military despot, and by the conspiracy of men false to their country and religion. It requires no depth of understanding to perceive that it was a Machiavelian stroke of policy to remove this guardian of the national faith, in order that with discordant sects and infidelity, disunion and strife might pervade the land, and Spaniards might lend a willing ear to the syren tones of the stranger, who, in the name of liberty, was seeking to enslave and oppress them." On page 352, he says, "In regard to the Inquisition, the Popes are fairly responsible for its origin and organization as an ecclesiastical tribunal, and they may be considered as approving the civil jurisprudence of the age, by which heresy was declared a capital crime." We thank you for the admission. What evidence can you give us that Popery has changed



in this respect, and has ceased to be persecuting in its spirit?

In the last paragraph but two, the Bishop says: "I abandon to the censure of the age, the principle on which the Inquisition was based, namely that heresy is a crime against society, punishable by civil penalties, and even by death." p. 353. Bishop K. is very nice in the selection of his words on some occasions. He is so here. He "abandons" the principle. A man may abandon a cause for two reasons; first, because it endangers something of more value, or secondly because he thinks it wicked. Not a word does the Bishop say, which intimates that he regards it sinful to punish men with death for heresy. He is "horrified!" But he does not condemn the Inquisition. He "abandons the principle," not because he thinks it wicked, but because Americans will not endure an open and stout defence.

In the last paragraph, p. 354. Bishop K. says, "If I cannot hope to relieve the memory of the Popes of the odium which has been cast on it, it should be shared with their age; and they should be credited for their efforts to secure mercy for the penitent." The Bishop's last sentence is in these words; "In whatsoever way it may please us to account for the change of civil jurisprudence, and of general sentiment, it is not just to embitter social feelings, by recalling the severity, or the cruelty of an institution, which has passed away, but acquiescing in the humane and liberal sentiments and laws of our own age, we should cherish kind feelings towards one another, and avoid all occasions of religious strife, which is most baneful to the common peace and weal."

The Bishop is very careful not to intimate any opinion as to the desireableness, on the whole, of the tolerant spirit of this age, over the spirit of the days of persecution. We account for the change in favour of freedom by the spread of the great Protestant principle of the right of private judgment. The utmost the Bishop seems willing to do is simply to "acquiesce" in the humane and liberal sentiments and laws of our own age. Protestants go further. They vindicate and glory in them. Let them never cease to do it. We like the Bishop's exhortation to "cherish kind feelings towards one another, and avoid all occasions of religious strife." But would it not come with a far better grace from him if he had not written twenty-five octavo pages for the purpose of defending, or excusing, or justifying

- an institution founded, and through all its history conducted on principles of deep and essential malignity.

We do not hesitate to recommend Bishop K.'s book to all those faithful men, who are called to defend the truth in this land against papal superstitions and despotism. It will furnish them with powerful weapons of war. Its admissions are fatal to Popery.

ART. III.—1. *Baptism, with Reference to its Import and Modes.*

By Edward Beecher, D.D. New York: John Wiley. 1849. 12mo. pp. 342.

2. *Infant Baptism a Scriptural Service, and Dipping unnecessary to its Right Administration; containing a Critical survey of the leading Evidence, Classical, Biblical, and Patristic; with special reference to the work of Dr. Carson, and occasional strictures on the views of Dr. Halley.* By the Rev. Robert Wilson, Professor of Sacred Literature for the General Assembly, Royal College, Belfast. London. 1848. pp. 534.

THE titles given above are those of the two most recent works of importance on the Baptist Controversy. The one first named treats only of the Mode, the other of both the Mode and the subjects of Baptism. But as Professor Wilson's work came to our hands after we had laid aside the former treatise for notice, we shall still confine ourselves to that branch of the subject which they treat in common.

Several considerations have led us to take a special interest in the labours of Dr. Beecher: the importance of the subject, the fact that the work has been done by a countryman of ours, and the additional fact that it has brought down upon him a shower of insolent vituperation as gratuitous as it is unchristian. We are no champions for Dr. Beecher; we disagree with him in some points; and he is well able to answer for himself: but we take pleasure in testifying that he has performed his task with the erudition of a scholar and the spirit of a Christian.

The First Part, occupying fifty-four pages of the present volume, originally appeared in the *Biblical Repository* of New

York, and was republished in Great Britain. Mr. Beecher did not regard the work as complete; but in this form it became the basis of Dr. Carson's reply. But before this reply came to hand, the author had gone on to publish his Second Part. This reply of Dr. Carson is a pamphlet of seventy-four pages, devoted entirely to a consideration of President Beecher's first two numbers, constituting the First Part, as now collected. The Third Part contains the first reply to Carson. The spirit of the Baptist champion seemed to call forth no rebuke from his brethren in this country. "Anger and wrath," say they, "evaporate in abuse. But no one will find this applied by Dr. Carson to his opponents." Now men will differ as to the standard of comity in writing, as well as in social parlance; but we might safely leave the matter to be determined upon a small *florilegium* of the Doctor's embellishments. He charges his American opponent with "perverse cavilling;" declares himself called "to put obstinacy to the blush, and overwhelm it with confusion;" and pronounces him guilty "of blasphemy." President Beecher's philosophy is "false, absurdly and extravagantly false;" "the only merit (he adds) this nonsense can claim is, that it is original nonsense." "Am I," he weakly cries, "to war eternally with nonsense?" "I am weary with replying to childish trifling." "It is sickening to be obliged to notice such arguments." Poor Mr. Beecher had ventured to speak of an argument as resorting to all manner of shifts. This is too much for Dr. Carson: "What shall I say of this? Is it calumny, or is it want of perspicacity?" His opponent is declared to give the lie to the inspired narrative; to be void of a soul for philological discussion. The result of the controversy is thus stated by Dr. Carson: "I have met every thing that has a shadow even of plausibility, and *completely dissected my antagonist*. Am I not now entitled to send purify to the museum as a *lusus naturæ*, to be placed by the side of its brother *pop?*"

President Beecher made a full reply to Carson. The only notice of this, so far as we have ever learned, was an answer of nine pages and a half. It was written for popular effect, and has been ridiculously lauded by the author's admirers in America. It is abundantly answered in the Fourth Part of the volume before us.

Dr. Beecher has shown himself in this work a most patient and well-informed philologist, and an acute and conclusive logician. This he does even in spite of the manner in which he chooses to present his argument, and which tends to render still more dry and repulsive a subject in itself of small attractions. It is a hard book to be read, though a valuable one to be consulted. We confess our preference for the time-honoured methods of the best English writers of giving their thoughts in flowing argument, and what the old authors would have called *discourse*; and we cannot comprehend why, in imitation of the least tasteful people on earth, we should sacrifice everything to ease of reference. The splitting up of material into minute portions, with abundance of Roman and Asiatic numerals, gives an appearance of great method, but not unfrequently produces the very evil which is deprecated. Unless a concordance is to be made to a theological work, we see no reason for renewing the device of Athias and Robert Stephens, and dividing it into *verses*. Dr. Beecher sometimes comes near this. The work is in four Parts: this is well, as these portions are divided as to time. The parts are divided into chapters, and also into sections; and the sections are sometimes subdivided into enumerated members. For example, the sentence: "The believer's spiritual death is to live," may be referred to, as on page 98, as Part I., Chapter II., § 33, Division 3 of that section, and Article 5, of the numbered sentence, on the above-named page. This is simply ludicrous, and tends more than any thing in the matter, or even style, of the author, to produce that heaviness with which we hear the work charged. In respect to style, Dr. Beecher is perspicuous and strong, and occasionally, when he forgets to count his steps, easy and vivacious, as some of our citations will serve to show.

The proposition which Dr. Beecher undertakes to prove is, that the word βαπτίζω, as a religious term, means not to dip, nor to pour, nor to sprinkle, nor to apply water by any specific mode, but to purify. It is important that this be constantly kept in mind, as otherwise the course of his argument must be sometimes obscure; such it seems to have proved, to writers on both sides.

To establish this position, Dr. Beecher argues first from John iii. 25, where the dispute between the disciples of Jesus and those of John was concerning "purification," that is concerning



"baptism." That purification here means baptism, he argues from the whole context; and is sustained by all the fathers, as well as by Schleusner, Wahl, Vater, Rosenmüller, de Wette, Bretschneider, and even Ripley. He lays great stress on this as a classical passage in the controversy: "It was by means of this passage," says he, "that the Holy Spirit, as I humbly trust, first gave me a true insight into the meaning of this word."

This is confirmed, when we observe the expectation among the Jews, that the Messiah should baptize. Of this there is no Old Testament prediction, unless in those passages which foretell that he should purify. Though it might have been gathered that he should sprinkle or pour, it is nowhere intimated that he should dip. Yet the people expected him to baptize; that is, argues Dr. Beecher, to purify. Add to this, that the baptism of the Holy Spirit, in regard to its agent, subject, means and effect, demands the notion of purifying and excludes the notion of dipping; for the agent is the Divine Spirit, the subject is the human spirit, the means are spiritual, and the effect is purity; and in such relations the meaning *dip* is absurd. Think of the form, "I *dip* you *in* the Holy Ghost."

Again, the end of baptism is to indicate sacrificial purification, or the remission of sins. Now, if we find the word used to denote such purification, we are confirmed in our rendering. It is precisely thus that we find it used. Baptism is a rite symbolizing the remission of sins, and is used as if synonymous with cleansing. Mark, i. 4; Luke, iii. 3; Acts, iii. 38. Dr. Carson, according to his favorite method when under logical pressure, treats this argument as "no more to the purpose than a treatise on logarithms." The author replies by showing that without his distinction much of the language of the fathers on baptism would be unintelligible. "Sprinkling with blood is not an immersion, nor is it a washing, nor is it, in the common sense of the term, a purification, for blood of itself defiles. But the shedding of blood secures the remission of sins, and the sprinkling of blood is an expiation, that is, a sacrificial purification. And if it were not for this view, the language of the fathers, when they speak of sprinklings of blood as baptisms, could not be understood. But take this view, and all is plain. Indeed, it furnishes an argument against the sense immerse, of irresistible

power. And although this is not much to Dr. Carson's purpose, it is very much to mine."

In Heb. ix. 10, the phrase, *divers baptisms*, is obviously taken in a generic sense to denote Mosaic purifications of any kind. Now it is remarkable, that no immersions of bodies are any where enforced under the Levitical law. The Hebrew word for dip is never used, but always that for wash, or purify; this escapes the English reader, who here naturally but incorrectly thinks of immersion. The early immersions under the law were those of vessels, sacks, skins, &c.: to these we cannot suppose Paul to have had reference. These Levitical purifications involved no necessity of dipping. They include cleansing by water, cleansing by blood, and even cleansing by sprinkling the ashes of a heifer. Heb. ix. 13, x. 22. A happy citation is made from Ambrose: "*Per hysoppi fasciculum adaspergebatur agni sanguine, qui mundari volebat typico baptisate.*"

The argument from Jewish purifications in Mark vii. 4-8, and Luke xi. 38, is well presented. In these the obvious sense of βαπτίζω and βαπτισμός is cleanse and cleansing. "It is no more likely that a want of *immersion* offended the Pharisee, (Luke xi. 38,) in the case of Christ, than it is that this was the ground of offence in the case of the disciples, Mark vii. It does not appear that Christ had been to the market. Nor is it likely at all that an immersion was expected as a matter of course before every meal, even on coming from a crowd. The offence in the case of the disciples, was that they had not washed their hands. An immersion was not expected of them, though they had been in crowds. Why should it be of Christ? Kuinoel, on this passage, well remarks, that the existence of any such custom of regular immersion before all meals, cannot be proved."

Dr. Carson becomes more sturdy and amusing than usual, in regard to the baptism of couches. He says that he will maintain immersion until its *impossibility* is proved, and suggests that the couches might be so made as to be taken to pieces for this end! He has proved—he says—the meaning of the word: the Holy Ghost affirms that the couches were immersed and to call this absurd, is to charge the Holy Ghost with uttering an absurdity."

Dr. Beecher's position, then, in regard to the Biblical argument, is this: if we admit that in the days of Christ, καθαρίζω

was the import of βαπτίζω, taking all the texts of the New Testament together, then have we no right to affix to it a modal signification.

From the Biblical, the author proceeds to the Patristical argument; and here, as we think, the chief merit of his work appears, in the fulness, fairness, erudition, and hermeneutical skill which are displayed. So far as we are informed, there is no other writer on baptism who has gone so deeply into an original investigation of the Fathers; and much as Carson and others may deprecate this branch of the argument, it proves to be one with which they can ill cope. Availing ourselves of Dr. Beecher's own *status quæstionis*, we may thus exhibit what he proposes to establish by the inquiry. The question is not whether βαπτίζω sometimes means to immerse; this is admitted. It is not whether the Fathers do not so use it, both literally and figuratively. It is not whether they considered immersion, in common, as proper. But the question is, whether the Fathers directly declare that βαπτίζω has the meaning to purify, in the ordinance of baptism. To follow the author into all the details of his argument on this important point, would be too much like invading his copyright; we shall, however, indicate the train of his reasoning, though, in one or two essential particulars, we think his zeal has hurried him into violent constructions.

The main proposition is, that the word, as religious, means, to purify. The proposition, in regard to the Fathers, is, that their *usus loquendi* can be best explained by this meaning. For instance, this shows how 'regenerate,' and like words, came to be used for 'baptize.' It shows the origin of Baptismal Regeneration. And Dr. Beecher does not ascribe the origin of the usage of ἀναγεννάω, as a synonyme of βαπτίζω, to the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, but the latter to the former.

There is philological proof that the word was often used by the Fathers in the sense of 'purify.' The earlier Christians do not use the word βαπτίζω so often as some synonyme derived from the senses just named; fixing the mind of the reader, not on dipping, but on cleansing. And this is the more signal, when we observe how the Baptists are driven by their hypothesis so completely to the opposite extreme, that Dr. Carson denies point-blank that baptism contains any reference to

cleansing! The Fathers often use the term in the ritual and Levitical sense, and in such connexions as to exclude every meaning but that of cleansing. They sometimes, in describing the rite, use *καθαίρω* or *καθαρίζω* alone. Thus Gregory Nazianzen says: "Thou shalt see Jesus purified (that is baptized) in the Jordan, with my purification, (i. e. baptism,) or rather, sanctifying the waters by his purification."

In order to account for the alleged early prevalence of immersion, and thus to remove a presumption against the author's meaning, he enters upon an argument against the popular assumption, favoured even by Professor Stuart, that if the Fathers did immerse, they must of course have believed that the word means to immerse. On the other hand, in full consistency with the meaning purify, Dr. Beecher ascribes the prevalence of immersion to oriental usages, and the habits of warmer regions; to a false interpretation of Rom. vi. 3, 4, and Col. ii. 12; and to a very early reverence for forms. To feel the force of the last cause, we have only to look at the veneration, and almost idolatry, with which the more ignorant Baptists, especially in the South, regard the going into the water.

There are some decisive cases, in which it is absurd to assign any other meaning than that which is proposed. Such a one is the well known baptism of blood, whether applied to Christ or the martyrs. If Dr. Beecher is right here, the Fathers apply the word to the *act of making an atonement by shedding blood*, even where no one is ever spoken of as immersed, or even, he thinks, as sprinkled. "Our probation," says Origen, "extends not only to stripes, but to the shedding of blood; for Christ, whom we follow, shed his blood for our redemption, in order that we may leave this world, washed in our own blood alone; for it is the baptism of blood alone which renders us more pure than the baptism of water. Nor do I say this presumptuously, but the Scripture authorizes it, by the statement of our Lord to his disciples: 'I have a baptism to be baptized with which ye know not.' You see, therefore, that he called the shedding of his blood a baptism." In several of the instances cited, the Greek preposition used renders the idea of immersion impossible.

It was common to speak of martyrs as having received a baptism of blood. This was called a baptism, not because the



martyr was immersed, for in fact he was not, unless in the rare instance of his being drowned. There is no thought of that which is the fixed idea with modern formalists, namely of dipping. "It is so called simply because, by suffering, by effusion of blood, he secures the forgiveness of sin." Hence the expressions, baptism *by* martyrdom, *by* suffering, and *by* blood, not immersion *in* martyrdom, &c. It is cleansing. So Gregory Nazianzen says: "it is more august than the others, because after it the martyr is no more polluted." So Augustine:—"Similes Christo martyres, quos post, aquam veri baptismi sanguis baptista perfundit:"

"I do not indeed affirm that they did not, any of them, at any time, use it as a religious term to denote *immersion*. To say this intelligently, would require a certainty that every usage of it by the Fathers had been seen, which, in my case, certainly is not true. But I must say, that even if such cases can be found, they will not disprove my position. They can only prove inconsistent usage; and this I have already admitted would be nothing strange, and might even be expected in writers so numerous and so various. Still, when I consider the extreme power of the usage which I have proved, when I find it clearly and decidedly, even in the eleventh century, I am inclined to believe that a general perception of the true sense was not lost or obscured, till the Greek language itself sank in the ruins of the Eastern empire; and that the present state of opinion has been produced by party spirit, and by the mistakes of learned men to whom the Greek was a dead language, and who, being familiar with the style and usage of classic Greek, as that which holds the earliest and primary place in the modern systems of education, have allowed it to expel the true spiritual and sacred sense of the word, and, in place of it, to introduce a merely physical, and, too often, barren and profitless external act."

After the full and learned proofs of Dr. Beecher, it is scarcely credible that this is the very portion of his work, concerning which Dr. Carson says in his answer: "He does not appeal to the use of the word by the Fathers, but to other words applied by the Fathers to the same ordinance."

The early and decidedly predominant idea of the rite, according to Dr. Beecher, was that it was the appointed and almost the only means of obtaining remission of sins. Its name might therefore be expected to indicate this idea; and so it does, in the sense of purifying, but not in the sense of immersing. The words with which βαπτίζω is interchanged show the same acceptance of the word. They are, λούω, ἀγιάζω, ἀγνίζω, ἀναγεννάω, *purgo, mundo, emundo, lavo, abluo, diluo, eluo, perfundo*; toge-

ther with the corresponding nouns. At the same time very little disposition is shown to use equivalents of immersion. When immersion is definitely spoken of, the word is not generally βαπτισμός, but καλύδουσις. "Why is this," asks the author, if βαπτισμός never means any thing but immersion?" Indeed, this word is so constantly employed for the rite, that when in a certain case there is a deviation from the common use, and βαπτισμάτα is employed for the dippings, a note is deemed necessary by Zonaras, informing the reader that βαπτίσματα here means καταδύσεις; as if to say, βάπτισμα is not here used in its common sense of purification, but denotes *the act of immersion*.

Early Christians took much interest in the question, "Why was Christ baptized?" Now, it is full of meaning, that, in discussing this, they do not try to answer the question, "Why was he *immersed*?" but solely the question, "Why was he purified?" So in speaking of the baptism of the Holy Spirit, they do not speak of it as an inward, *spiritual immersion*, but as an inward, spiritual purification. In none of the Fathers, says our author, is found the strange, incongruous and modern idea of an internal and spiritual immersion into the Holy Spirit and fire. Thus, also, the baptism of tears, often mentioned by the Fathers, is a *purification* by tears, not an *immersion* in tears. "The tear of prayer (says Nilus) is a good wash-basin of the soul."

"To conclude, the idea of purification is, in the nature of things, better adapted to the name of the rite, than immersion. It has a fitness and verisimilitude in all its extensive variety of usage, which cause the mind to feel the self-evidencing power of truth, as producing harmony and agreement in the most minute, as well as in the most important relations of the various parts of the subject to each other. This is owing to three facts: 1. The idea of purification is the fundamental idea in the whole subject. 2. It is an idea complete and definite in itself in every sense, and needs no adjunct to make it more so. 3. It is the soul and centre of a whole circle of delightful ideas and words. It throws out before the mind a flood of rich and glorious thoughts, and is adapted to operate on the feelings like a perfect charm. To a sinner desiring salvation, what two ideas so delightful as forgiveness and purity? Both are condensed into this one word. It involves in itself a deliverance from the guilt of sin, and from its pollution. It is a purification from sin in every sense. See § 12. It is purification by the atonement, and purification by the truth,—by water and by blood. And around these ideas cluster others likewise, of holiness, salvation, eternal joy, eternal life. No word can produce such delight on the heart, and send

such a flood of light into all the relations of divine truth ; for purification, in the broad Scripture sense, is the joy and salvation of man, and the crowning glory of God. Of immersion, none of these things are true. Immersion is not a fundamental idea in any subject or system. 2. By itself, it does not convey any one fixed idea, but depends upon its adjuncts, and varies with them. Immersion? In what? Clean water or filthy? In a dyeing fluid, or in wine? Until these questions are answered, the word is of no use. And with the spiritual sense the case is still worse; for common usage limits it in English, Latin, Greek, and, so far as I know, in all languages, by adjuncts of a kind denoting calamity or degradation, and never purity. It has intimate and firmly established associations with such words as luxury, ease, indolence, sloth, cares, anxieties, troubles, distresses, sins, pollution. We familiarly speak of immersion in all these, but with their opposites it refuses alliance. We never speak of a person as immersed in temperance, fortitude, industry, diligence, tranquility, prosperity, holiness, purity, etc. Sinking and downward motion are naturally allied with ideas which, in a moral sense, are depressed, and not with such as are morally elevated. Very few exceptions to this general law exist, and those do not destroy its power. Now, for what reason should the God of order, purity, harmony, and taste, select an idea so alien from his own beloved rite, for its name, and reject one in every respect so desirable and so fit? Who does not feel that the name of so delightful an idea as purification must be the name of the rite? And who does not rejoice that there is proof so unanswerable, that it is?"

The second chapter of the First Book is occupied with an exegesis of those vexed passages, Romans vi. 3, 4, and Colossians ii. 12. Our passing over this, is not from our undervaluing the importance of the argument, or the ability of the author, which is peculiarly evinced just here; but because the chapter does not admit of easy abridgement, and because it is not necessary to the chain of the reasoning.

Thus far the argument had proceeded, in its original form, and this was the part of it which first attracted the notice of Dr. Carson. The general results may best be stated in the author's own words:

"1. There is a baptism, infinitely more important than the external baptism, and of which the external baptism is but a sign.

"2. In the spiritual baptism, a believer is actually purged from sin and guilt, by the Holy Ghost. In the external, the forgiveness of sins is openly announced to him, on the assumption that he has repented and believes, as he professes.

"3. The person baptized is regarded as calling on the name of the Lord for forgiveness, and the baptizer as announcing his forgiveness in the name of the Lord. Acts xxii. 16.

"4. In the case of internal baptism, there is no such external use of the name of God, but a real forgiveness resulting in actual union to Christ. Hence,

"5. The form—*βαπτίζεσθαι εἰς ὄνομα Χριστοῦ*—is adapted to express the external baptism; *βαπτίζεσθαι εἰς Χριστόν*, to express the internal baptism, that actually unites to Christ.

"6. To this view, all facts accord. For in every instance where *ὄνομα* is used, there is internal evidence in the passage to prove that external baptism is meant. Matt. xxviii. 19, Acts ii. 38, Acts viii. 16, Acts x. 48, Acts xix. 5, Acts xxii. 16, 1 Cor. i. 13, 15."

"It appears, then, that the whole subject turns on three points: 1, the import of *βαπτίζω*; 2, the significance of the rite; 3, early practice. On each, the argument in favour of immersion rests on a *petitio principii*. 1. It is assumed as improbable that *βαπτίζω* can mean *purify*, without respect to mode, if it also means, in other cases, *immerse*. The falsehood of this assumption has been shown, the existence of an opposite probability proved, and the meaning *purify* clearly established by facts. 2. The improbability of *internal* baptism in Rom. vi. 3, 4, and Col. ii. 12, has been assumed, and external baptism has also been assumed without proof. It has been shown that the external sense, and not the internal sense, is improbable, and that against the external sense there is decisive proof. It has also been assumed that the practice of immersion by the Fathers and others, is proof of their philology, and that, therefore, they must have regarded the command to baptize as a command to immerse. The falsehood of this assumption has also been clearly shown. The result of the whole is, that as to the *mode of purification* we may enjoy Christian liberty; and that immeasurable evils attend the operation of those principles, by which many are now endeavoring to bring the church upon exclusive ground. There is no objection to immersion, *merely as one mode of purification*, to all who desire it. But to immersion as the *divinely ordained and only mode*, there are objections, deep and radical. We cannot produce unity by sanctioning a false principle; our Baptist brethren can, by coming to the ground of Christian liberty. The conclusion, then, to which I would kindly, humbly, affectionately, yet decidedly come is this: Stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage."

In the remaining parts of his labour, a less rigid method is observed by Dr. Beecher, as he was constrained to choose his position with reference to the assaults of the adversary. Dr. Carson's reply was a pamphlet of 74 pages, devoted entirely to the first two numbers of Dr. Beecher, which had been published in England under a mistaken impression that they were complete. It is no part of our plan to exhibit Dr. Carson's system to which frequent reference has been made in our pages. In



his reply he treats Dr. Beecher with an unmannerly contempt, which we rejoice to find our countryman meeting with a keen but gentlemanlike composure. Dr. Carson here as everywhere else begs the question, and assumes that he has proved that βαπτίζω means dip, and only dip. His induction of instances, as our author says, is far too narrow, if his purpose is to prove that it indeed means any thing else; especially as the word and its derivatives "occur in the writers of ecclesiastical Greek ten times, not to say a hundred times more frequently than in all the classic Greek writers taken together." There is no evidence that Dr. Carson has ever read the Greek Fathers on this subject; yet hear him, in his usual strain: p. 448. "Immersion is the only meaning of the word in every instance in the whole compass of the language." p. 449, "I tell Mr. Beecher it never signifies to purify." But here Dr. B. has a right to be heard for himself:

"Incredible as it may seem, yet it is true, that on an assumption so totally devoid of proof, on such a mere *petitio principii*, Dr. Carson's whole argument against me is based. Having *thus* found out and ascertained the meaning of the word, he calls it "the testimony of the word known by its use," p. 451; "the authority of the word," p. 452, and gravely informs us, p. 459, that "probability, even the highest probability avails nothing against testimony;" and p. 464, "to allege probability against the ascertained meaning of a word, is to deny testimony as a source of evidence, for the meaning of testimony must be known by the words used." But what is this testimony? Is the word βαπτίζω a living intelligent being? Is it conscious of its own meaning? Has it testified to Dr. Carson as to its universal use? If not, and if Dr. Carson has seen but a few out of the multitude of its usages, how dares he to call the little that he has seen, the universal, absolute, and exclusive sense of the word, and then to personify it, as a witness in a court of justice, swearing down all probable evidence by direct testimony? Never was there a more perfect illusion than such reasoning as this. It is neither more nor less than proving the point in question by incessantly and dogmatically assuming it. For until he has first assumed without proof, that he has "found" or "ascertained," that βαπτίζω means immerse, and nothing else, "in every instance in the whole compass of the language," even in those cases which he never saw, how can he make the word testify to that point?

"And yet this is his all-subduing argument in every case. First, by his canons of trial he makes the sense immerse possible, and then brings forward his witness, βαπτίζω, to testify that it has but one sense in the whole range of the Greek tongue, and that one immerse. He compares, p. 449, the meaning that he claims, to a client, *whose title to the whole estate is in*

evidence. P. 451, "The couches were immersed, because the word has this signification and no other." P. 450, "To deny this is to give the lie to the inspired narrators. The word used by the Holy Spirit signifies immersion, and immersion only." P. 453, "In fact, to allege that the couches were not immersed, is not to decide on the authority of the word used, but in opposition to this authority, to give the lie to the Holy Spirit. Inspiration employs a word to designate purification of the couches which never signifies anything but immerse. If they were not immersed, the historian is a false witness. This way of conferring meaning on words is grounded on infidelity." Again: "When the Holy Spirit employs words whose meanings are not relished, critics do not say that he lies, but they say what is equal to this, that his words mean what they cannot mean. [This is a respectful way of calling him a liar.]"\* I had said, Bib. Rep. April, 1840, p. 359,† "The question is not: Will we believe that the couches were immersed, *if the Holy Ghost says so*, but this, *Has he said so?*" and I decided that he has not. This, according to Dr. Carson, is a respectful way of calling him a liar. Now, in reply to all this, I totally deny Dr. Carson's whole ground work, in general, and in particular—in the whole, and in all its parts. There is no such testimony of the word βαπτίζω, as he alleges. Is it all a mere fiction of Dr. Carson's, sustained by no evidence but his own unproved assertion. It is a mere dream. Does Dr. Carson allege passages in which the meaning immerse clearly occurs? I do not deny the meaning in those cases: in other cases I do deny it, and claim that there is satisfactory evidence of another sense. And am I to be answered by such a mere figment as an alleged testimony of the word as to its own use in all cases in the whole language, when in fact all that this testimony amounts to, is Dr. Carson's unproved assertion? And on such grounds as these, am I to be charged with giving the lie to the Holy Spirit? And yet, this is the whole foundation of Dr. Carson's argument against me. His whole logical strength lies here. This mere petitio principii, dressed up in all shapes, and urged with unparalleled assurance, figures from beginning to end of his reply. In this consists its whole heart, and soul, and mind, and strength, and life. It has no energy that is not derived from this.

"Such, then, are Mr. Carson's principles—such is his system, and such the mode in which he applies his principles."

In his defence, Dr. Beecher is led to introduce additional testimonies, and even new topics, of much interest. Among these we would point out the whole discussion on clinic baptisms, and the application of the term to acknowledged sprinklings; likewise the beautiful and conclusive passage from Proclus, which we have never before seen quoted, in which he says (in

\* This sentence is omitted in the last edition of Dr. Carson's reply to me.

† See § 14.

the person of John the Baptist,) "How shall I, who am under sentence of condemnation, purify, i. e. acquit my judge?" πῶς βαπτίσω τὸν κρίτην ὁ ἐπεΐθυτος. Let any one try the rendering, "How shall I immerse my judge?" The general argument is also strengthened by various new considerations. For instance, there is no resemblance between the operations of the Holy Spirit and immersion. The Holy Spirit illuminates and purifies. "Immersion as such does neither. It signifies mode, and nothing else—and it may pollute as well as purify." Dr. Carson is driven to say that the baptism of the spirit "denotes excess, and nothing but excess." Dr. Carson asks, "Is not the resemblance in the effects?" Dr. Beecher answers, "No: the effects of the agency of the Holy Spirit in his work, are to illuminate and purify. The effects of immersion as such are nothing definite. The effects of immersion in dye, are to colour, in filthy water to pollute, in clean water to purify." No wonder Dr. Carson finds it necessary to take the extreme position: "The immersion of the whole body is essential to baptism, *not because nothing but immersion can purify*, but because immersion is the thing commanded, and because that, without immersion, there is no emblem of death, burial, &c." And he admits that "if mere purification were designated by baptism, *sprinkling or pouring* might have been used as well as *immersion*." Nothing could better show the value of the position taken by Catholic Christians, against immersionists.

But we must leave this interesting volume, with a renewal of our declaration, that we regard it as one of the most valuable contributions of our day to the literature of this controversy. Such we believe it to be, even for those who may dissent from many of its conclusions, or be slow to admit its main proposition. From the necessity of the case, the form of the work lacks unity; as the author was constrained to meet Dr. Carson in his successive attacks, and thus to go several times over the same ground. It would be an acceptable work, if Dr. Beecher, neglecting the particular treatises in reply, would digest the whole matter of these several works (for such they really are) into a single conspectus of the subject.

The work of Professor Wilson next demands our notice. The author is Professor of Sacred Literature for the General Assembly, in the Royal College of Belfast. His treatise indi-

cates his claim to the title of a learned divine and able controversialist. Without going so much into the minute philological inquiries as Dr. Beecher, to whose preceding labours he is however much indebted, he is much warmer and more popular in his mode of presenting the subject; avoids the complicated and distasteful divisions and subdivisions of his fellow-labourer; and is not only often entertaining in a high degree, but sometimes eloquent. His plan includes both the Mode and the Subjects of Baptism; but it is to the former that our attention shall be principally directed.

In the first ten chapters, Professor Wilson is engaged in settling the meanings of βάπτω and βαπτίζω. Admitting that the relation of βάπτω to the religious ordinance is indirect and remote, he regards it as important, and with a most ungentle hand, takes to pieces the Baptist exposition of Dan. iv. 30, and v. 21, where Nebuchadnezzar's "body was *wet* with the dew of heaven." He shows that the Baptist writers have signally failed in their attempts to confine the original of these passages to a modal application, and above all to the mode of immersion; that the Septuagint renderings do not countenance the doctrine of an exclusively modal sense in the original; since in two of the five instances in which the Chaldee verb occurs, the Greek translator does not render it dip, but uses a term which, it is admitted on all hands, has no reference whatever to mode; and that Dr. Carson's method of explaining the figure is forced and untenable. From this he passes to the secondary sense of βάπτω, that is, to *dye*. Here Dr. Carson is found opposed to his brethren. Herodotus speaks of "*dyed* or coloured garments," without any specification of mode. Aristotle applies the verb to cases where dipping is out of the question; as when he says: "But *being pressed*, it *dyes* and colours the land." Hippocrates, describing the effect produced by the application of a certain liquid, says—"ἐπειδὴν ἐπιστάζει, ἱμάτια βάπτεται"—"the garments are *dyed* when it *drops upon them*." Not (as Carson pretends) that Hippocrates "employs βάπτω to denote dyeing by *dropping* the dyeing liquid on the thing dyed," but that he employs it to denote dyeing without any reference to mode, except by another verb. As a favourable specimen of Professor Wilson's lively style and searching exegesis, we insert his commentary on the never-to-be-forgotten death of Crambophagus:



"In the *Batrachomyomachia*, the *Battle of Frogs and Mice*, a mock-heroic poem, falsely ascribed to Homer, depicting the sad fate of one of the champions, called Crambophagus, who fell mortally wounded, the poet says—v. 218—

Κάδδ' ἔπεσ' οὐδ' ἀνένευσεν ἐβάπτετο δ' ἅματι λίμνη—

Not to dwell on the trifling circumstance that Dr. Carson mistakes both the name and genus of the fallen combatant, this passage affords occasion for advertg to the somewhat curious history of what may be styled a traditinary mistranslation. So far as we have been able to trace the genealogy of the blunder, it originated with Dr. Gale,—no very uncommon event in the life of that learned author—and it has since been honoured by the patronage of scholars, who greatly excelled the doctor, if not in the extent of their literary attainments, at least in their character for acuteness, and general critical ability. Gale renders the passage thus;—'He *breathless* fell, and the lake was tinged with blood.' Whether the correctness of this rendering was challenged from the days of its author, till the appearance of Dr. Carson's treatise on Baptism, we are not aware; but in that publication it was slightly modified, as follows:—'He fell, *and breathed no more*, and the lake was tinged with his blood.' The next leading name in countenancing this singular version, is that of Dr. Halley, whose renderings generally evince the accuracy of sound scholarship; and who, in regard to βαπτίζω, has publicly brought against Carson the charge of 'following Dr. Gale with good heart through mistranslations as well as correct versions.' Yet, with all his known talent and acquirements, he has adopted in substance the version, and in terms the mistake of Dr. Carson. Here are the words:—'He fell, *and breathed no more*, and the lake was *baptized* with his blood.' The substitution by this author of *baptized* for *tinged*, which is the reading in the version of his predecessors, will not be considered an improved rendering of the verb ἐβάπτετο.

"Now the blunder which disfigures the works of these learned authors, and which has been handed down by tradition from the great ancestor of modern Immersionists, consists in absolutely mistaking one Greek verb for another. The act of *breathing* they all understand to be expressed by a term which has no more connection with breathing than it has with walking or flying. Not a syllable is uttered by the writer of the mock-heroic poem, respecting the *respiration* of his little, cold-blooded hero; and, indeed, the true nature of the case, had it been known to such a man as Dr. Carson, might well have abated the nuisance of his sarcasm, and disposed him in view of his own fallibility, to extend a measure of indulgence to the ignorance and mistakes of weak brethren.

"The attempt of Professor Stuart, to translate this formidable Greek sentence, cannot be regarded as much more successful. His version runs thus:—'He fell, *without even looking upwards*, and the lake was tinged with his blood.' There is at least something novel in this translation, but the *new*, we apprehend, is not *true*. Whether it is a common practice with frogs, when mortally wounded, to *look upwards*, before they expire,

my acquaintance with natural history does not enable me to determine; and I am equally at a loss to discover how an author, of Stuart's varied and exact scholarship, could present such a specimen of his acquaintance with Greek literature. The upward look of a dying frog would be a study for a painter!

"We are prepared to exhibit, in contrast with these mistranslations, the correct rendering of the passage. The verb is ἀνένευσεν, which Gale, Carson, and their followers, evidently mistook for ἀνένευσεν, and Stuart referred to the root νέω, while in reality it is compounded of ἀνά up, and νέω to swim: and thus plainly signifies to *swim up, rise to the surface*. Accordingly, the true meaning of the original becomes equally manifest and natural,—'He fell, and rose no more, and the lake was tinged with blood;' or, as the poet Cowper has expressed with equal elegance and fidelity to the Greek—

'So fell Crambophagus; and from that fall  
Never arose, but reddening with his blood  
The wave, and wallowing,' &c.

Even in this decisive example Dr. Gale still contends, in defiance of the established principles both of literal and figurative interpretation, that βάπτω retains at least hyperbolically the modal sense of immersion. This untenable view is met by Carson with unsparing and indignant exposure. 'What a monstrous paradox in Rhetoric,' he exclaims, 'is the figuring of the dipping of a lake in the blood of a mouse!'—[Frog, he should have said.] 'Never was there such a figure. The lake is not said to be *dipped in the blood*, but *died with the blood*.'

In Ezekiel xxiii. 15, the "images of the Chaldeans, portrayed with vermillion," are represented as "exceeding in *dyed attire*—παπαβαπτρά—upon their heads: "βάμμα is so used in Judges v. 30; (according to Brenton's version of the lxx.) "there are spoils of dyed garments for Sisera, spoils of various dyed garments, dyed embroidered garments." In the Syriac and Ethiopic versions of Rev. xix. 13, it is remarkable that the "vesture dipped in blood"—βεβαμμένον—is rendered by terms which signify to *sprinkle*; and it is still more remarkable that Origen, citing the verse from the Greek text of his day, employs ἐξέβατισμένον. This, however, is not urged as in favour of the modal sense of sprinkling.

A convincing argument is next derived from the fact that this secondary meaning has wrought itself into the structure and very syntax of the language. The argument is Dr. Halley's. Not only is the verb used for dyeing, but the construction is so varied as to make, not the thing coloured, but the colour itself, the object of the verb; as when we say "he dyes blue."

The argument from the derivatives of βάπτω, has long been familiar to us, and has been presented in our pages. It might have been set forth more extensively in this work, with an increase of strength for the general argument. "Dr. Carson introduces as immediate derivatives from βάπτω, the terms βάπτισις, δβάπτιστος, and δβάπτιστον, all of which the acquaintance of a school-boy with the elements of Greek etymology will enable him to trace, not to that verb, but to its descendant βαπτίζω. Such points are doubtless minute, and may not affect essentially the great questions of the baptismal discussion; yet they supply the best weapons for cutting the sinews of a contemptuous dogmatism, and routing from the field all abusive, perhaps unfounded assumptions of superior scholarship."

The chastisement of Dr. Carson, and his American endorsers and flatterers, as administered in the close of the fifth chapter, is as heavy as it is condign: but we must hasten to the examination of the principal term, βαπτίζω. Professor Wilson enters largely into the relation of the two verbs; their difference in meaning; the question whether the second is a diminutive, frequentative, causative, or continuative: points which attract but little of Dr. Beecher's attention, and from which Professor Wilson himself derives only the conclusion that the sense of the verb is to be derived, not from its form, but from the *usus loquendi*. Some principles are laid down which deserve rehearsal. First, the meaning of βαπτίζω, or of any other word, in the very early literature of Greece, is of subordinate moment in determining its New Testament use. Secondly, the verb has not necessarily the same specific meaning in the Hellenistic Greek of profane authors, and in the language of the New Testament: the word λόγος is a remarkable instance. Dr. Carson, among his unexampled boastings, has asserted it to be his own practice, in tracing the evidence for *mode*, to begin with the classics, and end with the hour of the institution. When we come to make an enumeration of the authorities which he has produced, we find that they "amount to *fourteen*, of which, startling as must be the announcement, no fewer than *seven* lie beyond the prescribed boundary!" Thirdly, the author holds the testimony of the Fathers, and of later writers generally, as to the meaning of βαπτίζω, to be exceedingly valuable. Acquaintance with the Greek Fathers enables the student

of Scripture to understand and appreciate more fully the style of the New Testament; and when they make indirect allusions to the sense of the term, (as when it does not apply to the sacrament,) we may justly ascribe much value to this testimony; especially as it often runs counter to the formalities of mode already prevalent in the church. These principles are laid down to fix the chronological boundaries of the evidence to be produced.

The whole remainder of Professor Wilson's work, so far as the mode is concerned, is taken up with evidence as to the meaning of βαπτίζω. He begins with the classics, and proceeds to Josephus, the Septuagint, and the Apocrypha, preparatory to an examination of the New Testament. With the same view he discusses λούω and its related nouns, and discloses the modes of bathing usual in Greece and Egypt. He goes more fully into the New Testament evidence, including an inquiry into Jewish proselyte baptism, and the washings of the Pharisees. In all this extensive and learned investigation, that which we most desiderate is any one clear, categorical assertion of the meaning to be made out: we are left to gather it from the analysis. In this particular, we are bound to say, Dr. Beecher possesses a decided advantage: he never leaves us in any doubt as to the precise point to be established. It will not be expected that we should follow Mr. Wilson through all the paths of his learned labour. We intend, however, to glean after him for some handfuls which our readers may enjoy.

The assertion of Dr. Carson, repeated usque ad nauseam, is that βαπτίζω means to dip, and nothing but to dip. This is here shown to be utterly incapable of proof from the classics; where the term is applied indiscriminately to the immersion of an object in the baptizing substance, and to the bringing of the baptizing substance on or around an object. Thus, as Professor Wilson says, the hand of a dying warrior is baptized when it is dipped into blood; cattle are baptized when the overflowing of the river overtakes and destroys them; and the sea-coast is baptized when the full tide pours in upon it the periodical inundation. In doing this, he shows how often Baptist authors shrink from translating βαπτίζω *dip*, just as they deny all their own principles by not calling themselves Dippers. It is a remarkable fact, stated by Professor Wilson after Dr. Halley, that



Hippocrates has employed βάπτω about one hundred and fifty times to denote the modal DIP, and its derivative βαπτίζω for the same specific purpose only once, if, indeed, that one occurrence belongs to the genuine text.

The following paragraph explains itself. It relates to a *Life of Homer*, attributed to Dionysius of Halicarnassus:

"In the Sixteenth Book of the Iliad, v. 333, the poet says of Ajax slaying Cleobulus,—“He struck him on the neck with his hilted sword, and the whole sword was warmed with blood”—Πᾶν δ' ὑπεθερμάνθη ξίφος αἵματι. On the latter clause of the sentence Dionysius remarks:—“In this he expresses greater emphasis, ὡς βαπτισθέντος οὕτω τοῦ ξίφους ὡς τε θερμανθῆναι,—as the sword being so baptized as to be even warmed.”—*Vit. Hom.* 297. Dr. Carson has borrowed from Dr. Gale the following translation of this passage:—“In that phrase, Homer expresses himself with the greatest energy, signifying that the sword was so dipped in blood, that it was even heated by it.” Dr. Halley is indignant at this laxity of paraphrase, as an utter misrepresentation of the sentiment of Dionysius. “Will it,” he asks, “be credited, that there is not a word about dipping in blood in the original? Dr. Carson says, that one of his opponents is as guilty of forgery, as if he appended a cipher to a one-pound note. I do not say his version is a forgery, because I dare not say it is wilful; but I do say it is a falsehood. \* \* \* Dionysius says that the sword was so baptized; and the obvious inference is, with blood, To introduce the words ‘dipped in blood,’ on the authority of Dionysius, is as scandalous a misrepresentation (truth compels me to use this language) as I have ever detected, where such things are too common, in polemical theology. I ask again, is Dr. Carson to be trusted without his authorities? In instances like this, his refutation would be to print the original on the same page as the translation.”—p. 478.

In weighing the evidence from the Septuagint and Apocrypha, the author finds occasion to introduce a learned and highly interesting excursus on the word Λούω, of which Dr. Carson had asserted that it always, unless with a regimen in the context, involves bathing of the whole body. This is effectually disproved by Professor Wilson; and in the process of doing so, he presents some valuable information as to ancient baths. There is no proof that immersion was common in Greek bathing.

“In the excellent *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities*, published some years since, under the able superintendence of Dr. W. Smith,—a work practically illustrating the advantages of division of labour,—the article on *Baths* presents us with the following clear and important statement respecting the mode of using the ἀσπις,—“It would appear, from the description of the bath administered to Ulysses in the palace of Circe,

that this vessel *did not contain water itself*, but was only used for the bather to sit in, while the warm water was poured over him, which was heated in a large cauldron or tripod, under which the fire was placed, and when sufficiently warmed, was taken out in other vessels, and poured over the head and shoulders of the person who sat in the ἀσπίς." From this pregnant instance the advocate for dipping may learn an instructive lesson. It is no proof of immersion, that a party is represented as going into the bath, and coming out of the bath. In the case of Ulysses, the descent and ascent are both distinctly recorded; while the author expressly informs us that the ablution was performed by pouring or affusion, and not by immersion"

"In the *Dictionary of Antiquities*, already quoted, it is broadly asserted, that so far as this important class of witnesses is concerned, not even a solitary testimony has been discovered, tending to identify the ancient mode of bathing, with that which is so generally prevalent in our own times. We extract the words:—'On ancient vases, on which persons are represented bathing, we never find any thing corresponding to a modern bath, in which persons can stand or sit; but there is always a round or oval basin, (λουτήρ or λουτήριον,) resting on a stand, (ὑποστάσις,) by the side of which those who are bathing, are represented standing undressed, and washing themselves."

"The common practice in Greece is incidentally, though very strikingly, referred to by Plutarch, in his *Ethical Treatise* against Colotes. After stating that you may see some persons using the warm bath, others the cold, he adds,—Οἱ μὲν γὰρ ψυχρὸν, οἱ δὲ θερμὸν ἐπιβάλλειν κελεύουσι,—"For some give orders to apply it cold, others hot." The force of ἐπιβάλλειν strongly corroborates the views which we advocate, and indeed constitutes an independent attestation. It appears to be borrowed from the ordinary mode of administering the bath, by pouring water upon the person. The prevailing practice has become as it were ingrained in the Greek language; and, accordingly, the term employed by Plutarch instantly calls up before our minds a lively portraiture of the παραχύτης, dashing or pouring the water upon the parties who surrounded the λουτήρ. The value of this testimony is greatly enhanced by its exact correspondence with the representations on the Greek vases, thus supplying one of those undesigned coincidences, which carry conviction to the candid mind, in a manner equally pleasing and impressive."

The New Testament evidence is the most important, and accordingly occupies by far the largest space. It is arranged under five classes, viz: "I. Occurrences of βαπτίζω, and its derivatives, which do not apply to the ordinance of Christian baptism. II. Occurrences in which these terms denote 'the baptism of John' or of Jesus, and the intimately related baptism with the Holy Spirit. III. Figurative applications, including strictures on the principles and reasonings of leading Baptist

writers, in the interpretation of such passages as 1 Cor. x. 1, 2; and 1 Peter iii. 21, 22. IV. Refutation of some of the principal objections of the Immersionists. V. Subordination of mere mode to the spirit and substance of the ordinance, as indicated by the expression, 'baptism into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.'"

As to the tabernacle rites, it is alleged, after Godwin, "that no terms which any Hebrew scholar will pretend had the signification of dipping, are ever used, in reference to the ceremonial purifications of the person." Yet these are the "divers baptisms" of our Baptist friends. As to the baptism of cups and couches, and the like, it is well maintained by us, that immersion is in the highest degree improbable. Lightfoot maintains that the baptism of couches was by sprinkling, and the term is identified with simple washing in the Syriac version and by the leading Orientalists and commentators. "Dr. Carson must have the couches dipped; and he will take them to pieces, if requisite, rather than permit any part to escape the plunge bath. When Origen refers to Elijah, commanding his attendants to *baptize* the altar, if the historical reference had perished, we doubt not that our Baptist polemics would have made out a case for immersion, altogether satisfactory to themselves. But we know, and Origen knew, that *the baptism consisted in pouring water upon the altar.*" In regard to the place in Luke xi. 38, Dr. Campbell translates thus: "But the Pharisee was surprised to observe that *he used no washing* before dinner." Gale and Carson here disagree; the former confines baptism to the hands of our Saviour, the latter of course claiming that the Pharisee expected his guests to dip the whole body. Dr. Wall charges Dr. Gale with "giving up all the cause at once." Josephus relates that the Essenes bathed themselves in cold water before dinner. Josephus was a Pharisee: and had immersion formed part of the ritual, especially of Pharisees, he would scarcely have named it as the peculiarity of a small sect. The evangelist's meaning, urges Carson, is plain. "With all its alleged plainness," replies Wilson, "the two greatest champions of Baptist views, Gale and Carson, cannot agree about the ablution which the Pharisee expected our Saviour to perform."

The Baptism with the Holy Ghost is ably treated by Mr. Wilson. "Jesus shall baptize you," his forerunner had said,

"with the Holy Ghost and with fire." We have the fulfilment of this, from the pen of inspiration, and are thus enabled to ascertain whether baptism with the spirit exemplifies immersion. Upon the record of this fulfilment our author founds the following proposition: "*That on the day of Pentecost, there was baptism, but no immersion.*" Dr. Carson affirms explicitly, that "on the day of Pentecost, there was a real baptism in the emblems of the spirit." "The disciples," he further informs us, "were literally covered with the *appearance* of wind and fire." He tells of "the wind descending to fill the house that the disciples might be baptized in it." "They were surrounded by the wind, and covered by the fire above, they were, therefore, buried in wind and fire." Professor Wilson rejoins: "Only think of a man *covered* with the *appearance* of wind! Is there a particle of meaning in the language? But this does not form our main objection. When Dr. Carson represents the wind as descending to fill the house, apart altogether from the philosophy of the case, we would gladly learn the Scripture authority for such representation. Does the Bible state that the house was filled with wind? Is the sacred writer responsible for the airy *baptisterium*, which immersionist genius has constructed?" Dr. Carson says "their baptism consisted in being totally surrounded with the wind, not *in the manner* in which the wind came." To which Professor Wilson replies: "If language have meaning, here is a baptism without regard to *manner* or *mode*, and admitted to be so by an author whose fundamental position is, that '*βαπτίζω* never expresses *any thing but mode!*'" Every one, as the author justly observes, feels that there is a marked difference between dipping in water, and baptizing with water. Again, to baptize with water is both sense and grammar; to dip with water would be regarded as barbarous or unmeaning. Yet we need only mark the forms, 'I baptize with the spirit,' and 'I baptize with water:' to be convinced that the word is employed with a latitude of meaning which forbids us to force the sense of dipping on a reluctant construction.

The train of arguments from the instances of N. T. baptisms, considered in their circumstances, is well presented. "Convinced as we are" says he "that the verb is employed again and again, where there is *no dipping* and *no possibility* of *dipping*, we distinctly maintain not only that circumstantial evi-



dence is admissible, but that it cannot be lawfully refused." The places, the circumstances, and the numbers are here brought into view. Why go to Jordan, they triumphantly demand, unless immersion were necessary? Why was the blind man, we ask in turn, sent to the pool of Siloam to wash? Was so large a collection of water needed for his eyes? "The argument for immersion founded on the *places*, has always appeared to us to be feebleness personified. Yet that Baptists do allege this consideration in their own favour is unquestionable. How stand the facts of Scripture history? Out of nine or ten localities specified in the New Testament, as the scenes of the administration of baptism, *only two, Aenon and the Jordan, possessed a liberal supply of water.* This fact will be found to grow in importance, the more it is pondered, especially in connection with the efforts of Baptist writers to turn it to the account of immersion. Had the Scripture instances uniformly associated the ordinance with "much water," or had this condition been realized in the majority of cases, their argument would have been plausible, if not convincing. But the divine record presents the reverse of all this. *Much water is the exception, little water the rule.* The ordinance could indeed be administered in the river Jordan, and at the many streams of Aenon; but so simple was the rite, that its performance appears to have been equally convenient in a private house, a prison, or a desert. If, then, the volume of the Jordan is requisite to pour vigour into the Baptist argument for immersion, how sapless and feeble must that argument become, when its nutriment is drawn from the stinted supply of a prison, or the thirsty soil of a wilderness? The very stress laid on the small minority of instances apparently favourable to immersion, certifies for the strength of the opposing view, which claims for its basis the decided and overwhelming majority." A happy argument is presented in regard to another oft-contested passage:

"The next passage claiming our attention is 1 Peter iii. 20, 21, in which the sacred writer, referring to Noah's ark, says,—“Wherein few, that is eight souls were saved by water. The like figure, whereunto *even* baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.” In the original, baptism is styled the *ἀντίτυπος*, corresponding in its effects to the preservation of Noah and his family, which thus occupie

by implication the place of the τύπος or type. How is immersion to be extracted from this language? Does the passage contemplate any resemblance whatever between the *mode* of Noah's preservation by water, and the mode of Christian baptism with water? In the sacred records generally, is the relation between type and antitype of a character so clear and definite, that in regard to the particular example before us, the actions to which these terms are respectively applied, do necessarily exhibit *modal* correspondence? He must be a bold expositor who will undertake to found the supposed necessity upon the *usus loquendi*, as ascertained by the most extensive induction: and if there is no general principle to rule the case, it simply remains for the interpreter to ascertain the meaning, under the guidance of the ordinary laws of exegesis.

"That the safety extended to Noah and his family by water, typified the salvation of the Christian by the baptism of the text, is evidently the substance of the Apostolic statement. In both instances, there is deliverance, and both employ the instrumentality of water. These are indisputable points of resemblance; and they abundantly warrant the application of the terms type and antitype. Our opponents, however, are strong for *modal* similarity. "What!" exclaims Dr. Carson, "Noah not immersed, when buried in the waters of the flood? Are there no bounds to perverseness?" Such sentiments are singularly extravagant, as well as unfounded. The fancy of a modern may dip Noah in the waters of the deluge;—it may paint his immersion and burial, as the ark floated gallantly on a shoreless ocean. Very different is the picture presented in God's word. The Apostle speaks of Noah as *saved by water*, NOT *immersed in water*. There was burial, indeed, and there was immersion, but not for Noah and his family. Noah and his family formed the merciful and solitary exceptions to the immersion and burial of the antediluvian world. Had the Apostle traced an analogy between baptism and the drowning of the ungodly, with what triumph our opponents would have founded upon that analogy their doctrine of exclusive immersion. But when baptism takes for its type, not the destruction of mankind at large, but the safety of Noah, then are they forced to help themselves out of a difficulty, by recourse to figures and fancies designed to meet the exigency of the case. Where do the Scriptures speak of Noah's immersion in water? Nowhere. The patriarch was saved by water—not by immersion in water, but by a divinely appointed means for preventing his immersion. Besides, had mode been prominent before the mind of the Apostle, in his reference to the flood, and to Christian baptism, we should have expected mode to influence his subjoined explanatory statement. When, for instance, he speaks of *baptism now saving us*, had mode stood as high with him as it does with our opponents, he would have necessarily added, "Not the dipping into water," &c.—Whereas his exegetical words are, "Not the putting away of the filth of the flesh," thus evincing, in the clearest manner, that his whole train of association in the passage contemplated merely the cleansing properties of water, as symbolizing spiritual purification."

The twelfth chapter, upon the evidence from the Fathers, is meagre compared with the elaborate discussion of the same topic by Dr. Beecher. These two able writers, while they succeed in demolishing the argument of Dr. Carson, are not agreed as to the precise ecclesiastical import of the term βαπτίζω. While Professor Wilson argues against a modal signification, in opposition to Carson, he seems to us to argue for a modal signification, in opposition to Beecher. We have already mentioned his singular reserve, in assigning the one fixed meaning of the word. We should probably not misrepresent him, if we said it was to *wash*; though he favours the admission of an original reference to the idea of *overwhelming*. He maintains with earnestness that circumfusions, pourings and sprinklings were all baptisms. In regard to the fundamental proposition of Dr. Beecher, namely, that in religious and ecclesiastical use, to baptize is to purify, he rejects it utterly. Without entering upon this controversy as umpires, we cannot but express our judgment, that Professor Wilson has devoted too little space in his large and able volume, to the argument of Dr. Beecher, whose eminent standing, in regard to the philology of this question, might claim for him a less summary treatment. We shall however quote what Professor Wilson says on this point, awaiting the further settlement of the controversy between them.

"We are able to produce what we conceive to be decisive instances of the use of βαπτίζω, where there is and can be no immersion; but never, even in a solitary instance, have we encountered it in the sense of purification. That meaning, as it appears to us, cannot be extracted from the verb, without recourse to questionable analogies and reasonings, which betray a larger measure of theological ingenuity than of philological acumen. The case on behalf of purification, we think, therefore, might be equitably disposed of by the Scottish verdict of 'not proven,'—thus leaving the way perfectly open for the reception of any new evidence, which its advocates may have it in their power to bring forward. That their writings contain some striking illustrations, of the sense for which they contend, is freely admitted; but we are not aware that they have hitherto succeeded in *proving*, by clear examples, the existence of that sense, and thus constructing a legitimate basis for their illustrations.

"We have been led to view the question in a considerably different light. Purification, in our judgment, is not baptism; though it may be, and often is, the immediate result of baptism. A contrary result, however, far from being impracticable, we find occasionally exemplified, as in *Aquila's* translation of

Job x. 31, 'Εν διαφθορᾷ βαπτίζεις με, 'Thou baptizest me in corruption.' One such instance, even apart from the obvious nature of the case, proves that the result will be defilement or purification, according to the character of the baptizing element. Consequently, if we would avoid the absurdity of attaching opposite meanings to the same term, we must employ the verb to denote simply the *process*, without including the *result*, which is necessarily implied in purification. With this distinction, the usage of the Greek language appears to be strictly harmonious. Whether the baptizing element overwhelms its object, or simply opens to receive it, or presents any other variety of application, a certain process takes, which may issue in great diversity of result, the result to be collected from the context or the general circumstances of each occurrence. Now, the question arising on the passage before us is, What process did the writer design to indicate by the expression, *baptism from a dead body*? If we rest the answer on the historical basis furnished in the book of Numbers, we should say that sprinkling and bathing were combined in this ceremonial baptism. As this answer, however, may be misunderstood, it is requisite to add a word of explanation. The baptism, then, we observe, may include the entire cleansing process enjoined in the Mosaic law, without involving the false principle that the verb *denotes* the two distinct acts of sprinkling and bathing. Such a double sense would be utterly incompatible with the universally admitted laws of language. On the condition already specified, the verb must refer generically to the process of applying water for the purpose of cleansing, while the details of the process demand the use of other terms, by which they may be appropriately designated. The man is baptized from a dead body,—that is, water is employed for his cleansing; but the mere baptism does not inform us of the manner of application. That information we derive from the law, in this case made and provided, which exhibits the process in detail. And that this ceremonial baptism includes all use of water, which the law demanded, seems manifest from the conclusion of the verse, where the writer asks, 'Of what avail is his washing? The baptism and the washing are not indeed strictly synonymous,—still both comprehend, though under different aspects, the entire process of this ritual cleansing. This view is sustained by the judgment of Schleusner, in his *Lexicon of the Septuagint*, who renders the words—βαπτίζόμενος ἀπὸ νεκροῦ,—*qui abluit se a mortuo*: and also by Robinson: and what is of more importance, the construction, and all the circumstances, historical and ceremonial, are favourable to it, while the opposing evidence consists in the pertinacious assertion of the exclusively modal sense of βαπτίζω."

This is not in our view an answer to Beecher, nor is it by any means as clear as we could wish. Indeed it may be taken as a specimen of a turgid and roundabout way of writing, which is rhetorical without being eloquent, and which too much prevails among our brethren north of the Tweed. The above cited sentence about Aquila may serve to show how obscure a



plain thing may be made by big and unusual diction. This fault co-exists with great occasional pungency and strength. Before laying down the elegant volume which contains Professor Wilson's labours, we must, notwithstanding our little stricture, express the pleasure with which we have perused it. A more readable, indeed a more delightful work, on a philological topic, we have never opened: it has a flow and *abandon* which remind us of the Bentleys, Warburtons, and Giffords, of a day which has gone by; especially in the castigatory parts where the principal opponent has a little of his own measure meted out to him. This as the author declares is not from any adoption of the *lex talionis*. The awkward and humiliating exposures which are made of more than one author are demanded by the cause of truth; and the tone and temper of sundry Baptist writers appeared to call for sharp animadversion. "If a writer is found constantly arrogating to himself superior scholarship, and vast powers of discrimination, and haughtily denouncing as insanity or nonsense, whatever may cross the path of his own favourite dogmas,—if with an air of learned infallibility he characterizes, as uncritical and illiterate, the production of able and highly educated men, and divines well instructed in the kingdom of God,—does it not become a public duty to turn the lamp upon himself, as he stumbles and falls in the thorny path of Greek syntax?—does it not become indispensable to guard the churches and the world against the blunders which mix themselves up with the *lettered* and oracular announcement of principles and their applications?"

The spirit of our opponents is probably familiarly known by as many of our readers as have ever been involved in this controversy. Dr. Carson, besides exemplifying it in the highest degree, seems to have had the property of inspiring others with it, especially in America. On the 28th of April, 1840, the Baptist American and Foreign Bible Society passed the following resolution: "Resolved, That by the fact that the nations of the earth must now look to the Baptist denomination ALONE for faithful translations of the word of God, a responsibility is imposed upon them, demanding for its full discharge an unwonted degree of union, of devotion, and of strenuous, persevering effort throughout the entire body." Moved by Prof. Eaton, seconded by Rev. H. Malcolm. In their report, they calumniously de-

clare, that the translations of all other denominations are "versions in which the real meaning of the words . . . . is *purposely kept out of sight*." They assert "that the British and Foreign Bible Society and the American Bible Society have virtually contrived to obscure at least part of the divine revelation." And a gentleman named Eaton says, Report, p. 79: "Never, sir, was there a chord struck that vibrated simultaneously through so many Baptist hearts from one extremity of the land to the other, as when it was announced *that the heathen world must look to THEM ALONE for an unveiled view of the glories of the Gospel of Christ*." "The sad error," says Professor Wilson, "against which this thunder is mainly levelled, consists in the admission of the words *baptism* and *baptize*, instead of *immerse* and *immersion*, into the great majority of translations of the New Testament. Mark the consistency of these men! They charge us with using *baptism*, as the veil of the original, not its vehicle; yet they call themselves *Baptists*! their churches the *Baptist* denomination!! their Bible Society the *Baptist* Bible Society!!! In the name of common sense and consistency, let them purge themselves of this banned term, before they proceed to the purgation of our Bibles. Let them stand before the public as *Dippers*, the *Dipping* denomination, and the *Dipping* Bible Society; and having thus cast the beam out of their own eye, they will bring a clearer vision to the task of pulling the mote out of a brother's eye. We cannot imagine that the meek framers of the resolution intended a reflection on the learning of Pædobaptist Christian communities. In view of the comparative amount and value of their own contributions to the cause of Biblical literature in its various departments, including translations of the Scripture into different languages, it would, we presume, savour more of foolishness than temerity to form so ludicrous an estimate of their own attainments. O, no—they possess too much discretion to place themselves in such an attitude; and we must, therefore, look for some other explanation of their exclusive fitness to supply the nations of the earth with correct versions of the Word of God. How is it that Baptists ALONE are competent to this stupendous undertaking? The reason is, that in their own lowly estimation, Baptists, and none but Baptists, are sufficiently honest and conscientious to translate intelligibly those passages of Scripture which relate to the

baptismal ordinance. It is not pride of learning, but pride of conscience, that prompts them to announce to the world that all except themselves are disqualified for executing *faithful* translations of the Bible."

The same spirit was manifested when Carson's Reply to Beecher appeared. The American Baptist Publication Society say: "We frankly confess, that the more we read on the Baptismal Controversy, the more our charity compels us to struggle against the conviction that forces itself upon us, that on this subject *it is not light* that is most wanted, but *religious honesty*." The italics are theirs, as Dr. Beecher states in making the quotation. The scheme which engenders such is not good. This question of form, as the author last named has said, has proved unfortunate.

"It is injurious to the Baptists, for it has injured them. Among them are eminently pious men, but a bad system has ensnared and betrayed them. How else can we account for it that they should have dared solemnly and formally to arrogate to themselves that they are DIVINELY AND PECULIARLY SET for the defence of THE GOSPEL, and that the heathen world must look to them alone for an unveiled view of the glories of THE GOSPEL OF CHRIST. Has it then come to this? Take away immersion, and is the gospel shorn of all its glories? Yea, is the gospel itself annihilated? Is immersion the gospel? What more can the most bigoted defender of baptismal regeneration and sacramental sanctification say than all this? But do our pious Baptist brethren mean all this? No! a thousand times, no. They know and feel, as well as we, that immersion is not the gospel! These facts only show, what all experience has shown, the danger of holding a system which makes a mere form of so much moment in practice, as to outweigh holiness of heart and of life. In spite of all reasoning and professions to the contrary, it will, as a general fact, concentrate on itself a disproportioned, an unhealthy interest, narrow the range of Christian feeling, chill it and check its expansion, and derange and distort the intellectual perceptions of the mind. Men of uncommon native nobleness of character, as Robert Hall, or men of great piety, may hold these tendencies of the system in check. But multitudes will not. Taught to regard themselves as distinguished from the rest of the Christian world by a form, the spirit of formalism, will have scope. The pernicious idea of divine favouritism, on the ground of forms, will grow up, and this will breed arrogance, censoriousness, exclusion, and the spirit of proselyting in its highest degree. Nor do I speak of tendencies merely; these tendencies are embodied in public official results. How else can we account for it that even evangelical Baptists, not Campbellites or Mormons, but even evangelical Baptists, have dared to arrogate to themselves a peculiar divine appointment to defend and promulgate the gospel of Christ, and

have dared to charge two leading Christian Bible Societies, the American and British and Foreign, as "virtually COMBINING TO OBSCURE a part, at least, of divine revelation," and to say, that in the translation of other denominations, "the real meaning of the words is PURPOSELY kept out of sight?" Is it no injury to pious men to be so ensnared and deluded by a false system, as to say and do such things as these? These are not the promptings of their Christian hearts, for that they have Christian hearts I will not doubt. No; it is the poison, the delusion of a false system that has done this."

---

ART. IV.—*A Memoir of the Life of James Milnor, D. D., late Rector of St. George's Church, New York.* By the Rev. John S. Stone, D. D., Rector of Christ Church, Brooklyn. Published by the American Tract Society, 150 Nassau-street, New York. pp. 646. 8vo.

THAT incorrigible wit, Sidney Smith, once maintained, among the many facetious paradoxes which have made his name unclerically famous, that it was a great disadvantage to read a book before reviewing it, because it prejudiced the mind! Happily for us, we had read the book at the head of this article before we had any thought of reviewing it, and furthermore we had no inveterate prejudices to be shocked by it. We have found it a very readable and instructive volume, which kept up our interest unflagging to the end; and we think it will amply repay any one who can command the leisure to peruse it. The biographer has executed his task well. Favourably known to the religious community by his *Life of Bishop Griswold*, an evangelical prelate, and by his exposition of the true nature of the Sacraments in his anti-puseyistic work, "*The Mysteries Opened*," he has in this production satisfied all the reasonable expectations of the public. Besides his sympathy with evangelical opinions, a long and intimate acquaintance with Dr. Milnor peculiarly fitted him for his task; and we opine that he was the young student and preacher in whom Dr. Milnor took so parental an interest, and whose correspondence is occasionally given in the *Memoir*.

It has been the aim of the biographer to let Dr. Milnor tell his own story as much as possible in his own words, supply-



ing only what was wanting, and furnishing the necessary links of connection. This kind of writing has the disadvantage of spinning out a memoir to an undesirable length, and of inflicting on the reader a great deal of minute detail in which he takes little interest; but on the other hand it is attended with the paramount advantage of placing the individual before us in his own natural character and every day costume. We feel that we are not looking at a stiff formal figure, dressed up for company, and fixed in a studied attitude. What we want is the unvarnished truth, that "touch of nature" which makes "the whole world kin." We are indeed disposed to think that the bulk of the volume might have been considerably reduced; but persons of the same communion and party with the late rector of St. George's, may attach a deeper importance to details which to us appear comparatively unimportant.

On the whole, the Memoir is a highly creditable production. The style is marked with elegance and concinnity. The selections from private journals and letters are copious, yet judicious; the junctions skilful and easy; the illustrations and comments piquant and felicitous. There is no fulsome panegyric, or elaborate attempt to canonize the departed; nor, on the contrary, is the work perverted into a mere vehicle for recording the biographer's personal or theological sentiments. The volume is adorned with a handsome portrait, engraved by Halpin from a daguerreotype, which strikes us, so far as our memory will serve, as an admirable representation of Dr. Milnor's pleasant, good-natured, open countenance, surmounted with its hoary "crown of righteousness;" betokening the spirit that beamed within, all purity, generosity, and benevolence, "an Israelite indeed, in whom there was no guile."

Had this book been of a merely denominational cast, we would have left its approval or censure to the notice of partisans; but as it reveals the warm beatings of a Christian heart, rising superior to the shibboleths of sect, and as moreover it contains some unequivocal and not unfriendly allusions to the distinctive tenets which this Review was established to advocate, we regard it as properly falling within our sphere. If there is a lovely sight on earth, it is that of union among Christians. When we think of it, we think of heaven. Bigotry may restrict itself to its own narrow pale; formalism may magnify externals

out of all proportion; but the generous child of God will venerate his Father's image wherever he sees it. He may commit mistakes, and sometimes contend against a brother, but he does it ignorantly; he honestly believes he is contending, not against a brother, but an enemy, for some precious truth of the gospel. No Christian hates a Christian because he is a Christian, or knowing him to be such. All who hold the Head are component parts of the body of Christ. All are one in Christ Jesus. Hereby we know that we have passed from death unto life, if we love the brethren. Union among the followers of the Lamb on earth, based on a common attachment to fundamental truth, and not purchased by unworthy compromises, is a type, and not only a type, but an antepast of heaven. All is union there. There is one body, one spirit, one faith, one hope, one Lord. My Dove, my Undeiled, is One, saith the Spouse. Our Lord prayed "that they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they may be also one in us: that the World may believe that thou hast sent me." The divisions of Christians have caused a sad stumbling-block in the way of the world. Their cessation would greatly facilitate the final triumph of the gospel, or at least remove a very common and formidable ground of objection. It is therefore a legitimate subject of prayer and action, that Ephraim may cease to annoy Judah, and Judah to vex Ephraim; that the watchmen may see eye to eye with neighbourly nearness, and with the voice may sing together, and not discordantly; that there may be one Lord, and his name one, over all the earth.

It is very refreshing to find so engaging an example of the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, as was presented in the late Dr. Milnor, and to trace in his life and actions the lineaments of a Christlike charity, and the liberal devisings of a large catholic heart.

Sprung from a Quaker ancestry in the city of Philadelphia, young Milnor was brought up in the principles of Penn. His nurture, however, was not of the strictest sort, as his father applied for a captain's commission at the commencement of the revolutionary war, and after the peace helped to form the body styled Free and Independent Quakers. Enough of the Quaker leaven was infused as inspired him with the most decided repugnance to Calvinism. He remained, nominally at least, in

the connection, until his marriage with a lady of the Episcopal persuasion, "with the assistance of a hireling minister," for which breach of discipline he lost caste, and was "formally read out of meeting." Such was the respect in which he was held, that very slight concessions on his part would have been accepted as an atonement. Those concessions he refused to make, and after that event, which happened in the year 1799, he rarely attended the meetings.

As a lawyer, Mr. Milnor's industry and business habits attracted towards him the public regard; and in 1810 he was sent as a Representative to Congress. There he proved himself a staunch opponent of the war of 1812, and became embroiled with the Speaker, Mr. Clay, in consequence of some animadversions which found their way into the Philadelphia prints, and were suspected by Mr. Clay to have emanated from his pen. The usual mode of reparation, so ridiculous were it not equally barbarous and cruel, was demanded; but Mr. Milnor, firm to the pacific principles in which he had been educated, declined the challenge. Some explanations appear to have ensued, and the affair was dropped. No one suspected, till the matter was recently brought to light, that these two distinguished individuals had ever stood on such terms of opposition to each other. It is greatly to Mr. Clay's credit, that when he afterwards was Secretary of State, and Dr. Milnor, then become a clergyman, was on a visit to Washington, he invited him to dine with him, and their intercourse was of the most friendly character, no allusion being made on either side to the past. When Mr. Clay was subsequently a candidate for the Presidency, Dr. Milnor was one of his warmest supporters.

What Mr. Clay's sentiments on the subject of duelling were a dozen years afterwards, the reader may be gratified to learn. They are seen in the following extract from an address to his constituents, in 1825: "Whatever I heretofore may have done, or, by inevitable circumstances, might be forced to do, no man holds in deeper abhorrence than I do that pernicious practice. Condemned as it must be by the judgment and philosophy, to say nothing of the religion, of every thinking man, it is an affair of feeling about which we cannot, although we should, reason. Its true correction will be found, when all shall unite, as all

ought to unite, in its unqualified proscription." What a pitiable confession of the want of true moral courage does such a statement exhibit! Various distinguished men have used similar language. They would have felt thankful to any one who would have set the example of declining this barbarous custom, but no one had the courage to make the beginning. It is no wonder that humbler men allow themselves to be bullied into a duel, when such statesmen as General Hamilton and Mr. Clay stand in so great terror of the finger of scorn as to do what their judgments and their consciences condemn.

It was about this period, that is, toward the close of his Congressional career, that Mr. Milnor became for the first time seriously awakened to the question of religious duty. It will be a curious and instructive employment to trace the steps by which he was led to an experimental acquaintance with religion, and to become at last a champion of those doctrines of grace from which he originally reluctated. In early life he was a thriving lawyer, of a social turn, unstained by dissipation or immoralities of any kind, but fond of gayety, fashion, and amusement. He was a frequent attendant at the theatre, and loved to relax from graver cares in the light circles of fashionable society. Indeed he was dissatisfied because his wife, who was of a more quiet and domestic disposition, did not sympathize with his taste for those gay recreations, a certain mingling in which he regarded, perhaps none the less decidedly from his Quaker origin, as necessary to his standing in the genteel world. Correct and methodical in his habits, he deemed a decorous attention to the external of public worship no less becoming, and after the sundering of his connection with the Friends, he took a pew in the First Presbyterian Church. Dr. John Blair Lynn was then the pastor, and being a man of polished taste, and captivating address, whose style of preaching was "liberal and unsectarian, though at once evangelical and moral," he sat under his ministry with great pleasure. Dr. Lynn was succeeded by Dr. J. P. Wilson, a preacher of a totally different stamp. Logic, not rhetoric, was his forte; he preferred the closed fist to the open hand; and he loved to support the distinguishing doctrines of Calvinism by the sternest and most rigorous reasoning, while his position and dogmatical manner, left his hearers no resource but submission or retreat. Brought



up from infancy in a horror of Calvinism, the latter was the course which Milnor chose. The entry in his diary is in these words:

"In a few years death deprived the congregation of this valuable minister, (Dr. Lynn,) and he was succeeded by the Rev. James P. Wilson, a man of great learning and most exemplary piety, but so devoted to the peculiar doctrines of the Calvinists, and the discussion of intricate points of theology, and though amiable in an eminent degree in private life, yet so illiberal, austere, and sour in the pulpit, that I could not, with satisfaction or profit, continue my attendance on his administration. My aversion to many of the dogmas of the Presbyterians, and to Mr. Wilson's style of preaching, induced me to take a pew in the new (Episcopal) church of St. James, where I now attend." p. 96.

This is an interesting statement, and shows how deeply rooted must have been the hostility to the doctrines of Calvinism, which drove an intelligent lawyer from the ministrations of a divine, learned, pious, and eminent for his reasoning powers and who had himself once belonged to the legal profession. Judging *a priori*, we should have supposed this would have been the very man for him. And had we not much ground yet before us, we might pause to ask whether we are not here also furnished with a key to the well known fact that the multitudes, who have of late years deserted the Society of Friends, have gone over in a body, with few exceptions, to the Episcopal church, which fined, and imprisoned, and persecuted their ancestors? But this query is by the way.

Mr. Milnor for a long time pacified conscience "by avoiding an absolute rejection of revelation, and substituting an unintelligent acquiescence in that miserable scheme of universal salvation." Feeling dissatisfied with the ground on which this scheme rested, he resolved to examine the Scriptures for himself. His views became modified in consequence, but were still tinged with errors of an anti-evangelical character, embracing "an undue appreciation of human effort, and a mischievous conceit of the merit of works." He was disposed neither "to sink himself, nor to exalt the Saviour." It was at this stage of his progress that he had a brief conversation with his friend, Mr. Thomas Bradford, jr., (a member of Dr. Wilson's congregation,)

which is thus reported. "Why," said he, "you have made your wife a Calvinist. I found her reading Scott's Force of Truth. I don't relish your spoiling a good Episcopalian. You Presbyterians are always talking about Paul, Paul. You never talk of what the gospel says, but always of what Paul says." His friend made no reply: they exchanged their farewells: and Mr. Milnor was soon again in congress, engrossed, as Mr. Bradford supposed, with his usual zeal, in the politics and the pleasures of the capital." p. 111. This was, however a mistake. Mr. Milnor had become satiated with pleasure and with politics. He spent his leisure hours mostly in his own apartment, and devoted himself more than ever to the study of the Bible. An extremely interesting description is given in his own words of a morning walk, in which the beauties of nature induced reflections on the immensity, the goodness, the kind providence, and the unspeakable love of God. But when from such glowing contemplations he turned to himself, he was filled with shame at his frailty, his sins, his earthly mindedness, and his rebellion against the sovereignty of Heaven. Deep despondency filled his mind, till relieved by recalling the long suffering of God and the promises of the Gospel. He returned to his chamber with humble confidence in God, but stripped of all reliance upon himself. p. 128.

The Holy Spirit was pleased to bless his diligent study of the Bible, and he was gradually led to embrace the plan of salvation in all its fullness and freeness. It was just a month after the walk above mentioned that his friend, Mr. Bradford, was surprised and delighted to receive a letter from him, detailing his inward conflicts, and quoting, the words of Paul, which he applied to himself, "I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing," &c. "Brother Milnor," cried Mr. Bradford in a rapture, "has found Paul to be as precious as we did!" p. 112. The developement of his Christian life was greatly assisted by his correspondence with this friend, copious extracts from which are furnished in the Memoir.

It was not long till in obedience to the impulse of conscience, and the manifest leadings of Providence, he entered into orders, and ministered acceptably, first in Philadelphia and afterwards in New York. It does not comport with the scope of this paper to enter into minutia as to his character or usefulness as a

preacher. His praise is in all the churches. Suffice it to say that he was decidedly of the evangelical school. His preaching was full of unction, and reached the heart. With his six Sunday schools, his evening meetings, and extra-pastoral labours, his hands were full. He carried his active, methodical, business habits into the church, and the consequence was that he was gradually looked up to as a centre of advice and influence. Until we read this memoir, we had no idea of the extensive influence which Dr. Milnor wielded, or the multifarious duties which occupied, without distracting, his attention. He was Foreign Secretary of the American Bible Society, and chairman of the Committee of Arrangements, and of the Committee on Versions; a manager of the American Tract Society, and chairman of the Executive and Publishing Committees; a member of the Council of the University of New York; connected as a trustee or patron with all the principal theological Seminaries of the Episcopal Church, and having in his hands the nomination to the Milnor Professorship in Kenyon College; Secretary of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of his own church, without salary; besides maintaining an active correspondence with the leading minds of the Evangelical party.

A dignitary, whom we conjecture to have been his intimate friend, Bishop M'Ilvaine, being on a visit in his house, and observing how he was resorted to from all quarters for counsel and direction, could not help telling him, "you have all the responsibilities and duties of the office of a bishop, but without its crown of thorns." p. 627.

Dr. Milnor's Christian charity and liberality of sentiment were conspicuous. His views were of the most large and catholic kind.

"He regarded all bodies, professedly Christian, who hold the Bible as their rule of faith, on the ground of its divine inspiration and authority, as, in some valid sense, parts of the visible Church of Christ. He was not of the number of those who limit the boundaries of this Church, so as to include those millions only which are covered by an episcopally constituted ministry and government, and who consequently regard the remaining millions of Christians, so called, as neither churches, nor parts of the Church, but, as in their collective states, certain nameless monstrosities, engendered amid the outer darkness of

the world, by the few rays of light which have happened to straggle beyond the favoured pale of privilege. On the contrary, he looked upon these millions as lying within that pale; as in the Church, and of the Church; as being, many of them, highly illuminated, and as animated with much of the best life and power of the Gospel of Christ. Taking this view, he held that there is a unity which reaches and includes all who are thus distinguished, a unity which holds in one visible whole, all the particular members of Christ on earth. Of this unity, therefore, he held that there ought to be, especially among Protestants, some visible expression, some recognized badge. This visible expression, this recognized badge, so far as our country is concerned, he could find nowhere more appropriately than in the union of Christians of different names in the American Bible Society, an institution whose sole work is to prepare and circulate through the world the simple standard of their common faith, hope, and practice." p. 597.

He loved to view the church of Christ as an extensive vineyard. Here and there different classes of labourers are engaged in cultivating the same great vine; their different modes of training it being determined by diversities of tastes, judgment, and skill. The roots strike deep into the same soil. The branches climb aloft towards the same heaven. Its fruitfulness is dependent on the same divine influences. And one and all who labour faithfully their allotted season, receive at its close, from the same Master, the same "penny a day." p. 644.

As a farther illustration of the remoteness of his views from the illiberality of High-Churchism, a conversation is repeated between himself and a clergyman holding the ultra doctrines. The latter shut the gate of heaven against all who were without the favoured pale, save as the uncovenanted mercy of God might peradventure grant them admittance. Dr. Milnor's honest face glowed with indignation as he replied, "Why, my good sir, if I held such views as you have expressed, I could not rest to-night on my pillow. I have beloved relations and dear friends who are without the pale, as you define it. Their hopes and mine rest on the same Jesus. Are they to be excluded from the covenanted benefits of his atonement simply because they have not been baptized in an Episcopal church, and do not worship according to a particular form?" At an-



other time, after his son had read to him the famous controversy between Drs. Wainwright and Potts, which sprang from Mr. Choate's eloquent description of the polity of New England, "a Church without a Bishop, and a State without a King," he mildly observed, "The difference between high-churchmen and myself is this: they magnify into essentials what I consider non-essentials." In reference to a course of lectures on the Distinctive Principles of the Church, he remarked, "I should prefer a course on the distinctive principles of the Gospel." p. 644.

With such men we can have no quarrel. If all Episcopalians were governed by similar evangelical and liberal sentiments, controversy would lose its bitterness. We might consent to treat with respect their conscientious ecclesiastical preferences, and smile at the "*tolerabiles ineptias*," and what they are so fond of styling, "our admirable liturgy." We might adopt the language of John Wesley, "We do not ask you to change your opinions; we do not say that we will change ours; nevertheless, if thine heart be right, as my heart is with thy heart, give me thy hand!" It is not with such men that we feel it in our hearts to break a lance, but with the heated, and generally narrow-minded zealots, who would convert Trinity church into a little Vatican, and call down fire from heaven to punish the odious Samaritan and schismatics. We should be at variance with the catholic spirit of our own standards, if we were to cherish bigotry and intolerance. The bigot stands rebuked by those standards, notwithstanding the misrepresentations of the Presbyterian Church, in which some of her enemies have indulged. After stating our belief in our own form of government as scriptural, primitive, and expedient, it is added, "In full consistency with this belief, we embrace in the spirit of charity those Christians who differ from us, in opinion or in practice, on these subjects."\* But we would be unmanly and spiritless cravens, wanting in self-respect, did we suffer to pass unanswered the arrogance that would put us on the same footing with the heathen, and invalidate our ministrations as so many "old wives' fables;" as Bishop Ravenscroft has stated the dogma in its most naked and offensive form, "that God's promises are limited to the visible church; that the church can be verified no other-

wise than by apostolical succession through the line of Bishops as distinct from Presbyters; and that consequently, every religious condition not thus verifiable, is destitute of revealed hope, and can have no scriptural ground of salvation." \*

It is gratifying to know that such exclusive and intolerant sentiments have been repudiated by many of the best, the purest, the godliest, and the wisest of the Episcopal communion. Among the low-churchmen of the days of William III. (when the title was first given, being applied to the opponents of the non-jurors,) shine the names of Tillotson, Moore, Patrick, Kidder, and Cumberland, distinguished no less for their charity, moderation, and desire to restrict the limits of ecclesiastical authority, than for their talents and learning. The doctrine of the exclusive divine right of episcopacy found no advocates in Cranmer, Jewel, Hooker, Whitgift, Hall, Usher, Burnet, or Wake. Bishop Burnet saw no acknowledgment of it in the Liturgy, Catechism, Articles, or Homilies.† Bishop Hall, who sat with Bishops Davenant and Carlton, in the Synod of Dort, uttered the following generous sentiments in a sermon he preached before that venerable body. "We are brethren, let us also be colleagues. What have we to do with the infamous titles of party names? We are Christians let us all be of the same mind. We are one body, let us also be unanimous."‡ Archbishop Usher professed his readiness to receive the sacrament from the hands of the Dutch ministers, if he were in Holland, or from the hands of the French ministers, if he were in Charonton.§ Wake, archbishop of Canterbury, warmly disavowed all sympathy with certain furious writers who pronounced non-episcopalians to have no true and valid sacraments, and so to be scarcely Christians.|| In our own country we refer to that pure American prelate, Bishop White, who held that in case of stringent necessity, the American presbyters were competent to ordain a Bishop, *suo proprio motu*, and whose sentiments were as follows: "Now if even those who hold episcopacy to be of divine right, conceive the obligation to it not to be binding when

\* Ravenscroft's Works, Vol. i. p. 408.

† Burnet on the xxiii. Article.

‡ See the sermon in the Acts of the Synod of Dort. p. 38.

§ Judgment of the late Archbishop of Armagh. pp. 110-123.

|| Murdock's Mosheim, vol. iii. p. 563.

that idea would be destructive of public worship; much more must they think so, who indeed venerate and prefer that form as the most ancient and eligible but without any idea of divine right in the case. This the author believes to be the sentiment of the great body of Episcopalians in America; in which respect they have in their favour unquestionably the sense of the Church of England; and as he believes, the opinions of her most distinguished prelates for piety, virtue, and abilities.\* Not otherwise thought that exemplary and evangelical prelate, Bishop McIlvaine, as he once expressed his sentiments in print, and we have reason to believe, from personal knowledge, that the mitre has effected no change. As to the consignment of all who are not favoured with Episcopal ordinances, "to the uncovenanted mercies of God," Mr. M. knows no such mercies; believes in no such mercies; he can find nothing in the Bible about any mercy for sinners, but that which the precious blood of the everlasting covenant has purchased, and which God hath promised to none but to members of the covenant of grace. Should he offer his Christian brethren of other churches no better consolation than "uncovenanted mercy," he would think it equivalent to an opinion that their souls are utterly destitute of hope. But, blessed be God, he is not obliged to regard them as in a condition so miserable. With all his heart he can carry to them, as beloved brethren in Christ, the overflowing "cup of blessing," and can say to "all that love the Lord Jesus in sincerity," of whatever name or form, "He that believeth in the Son hath everlasting life," and, "there is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit."† With these sentiments Dr. Milnor heartily coincided. He shuddered at the thought of excluding any from the covenanted benefits of the atonement, simply because they had not been baptized after the Episcopal form; and delighted in his own beautiful allegory, to contemplate the great Vine of Christ shooting its branches toward the same heaven, and the labourers receiving from the same Master, the same penny a day.‡

\* *White's Case of the Episcopal Churches in the U. S. Considered*, p. 28.

† *Memoir*, p. 644.

‡ *Answer to the Rev. Henry U. Onderdonk, D. D. 1827.* p. 16.

All that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution, in some way or other. It is true that persecution appears in another garb; she has been compelled to take down the scaffold and lay aside the axe; the rack is rusted and the faggot smouldering, and, like Bunyan's giant, she can do little more than sit in her cave and scowl at the passing pilgrims, and bite her nails that she cannot come at them. But all that she can do she does; and although life, limb, and property, are secured, yet there are other ways by which a conscientious and faithful servant of Christ may be rendered very uncomfortable; such as neglect, reproach, the slow-moving finger of contempt, detraction, and bitterness. His frank and honest soul knew no disguises and no compromise, and he was ever ready to meet his opponents on fair and equal terms. When High-churchmanship, and its ultra phase, Puseyism, came in like a flood, he was neither tardy nor ambiguous in his opposition. It was very natural, therefore, that in the diocese of New York, "he held virtually *no position*." He was studiously kept in the back-ground, and shut out of every post or office in which his talents and business habits might have made his influence felt. His evangelical style of preaching might have been overlooked, but his cordial coöperation with the Bible and Tract Societies was an unpardonable offence. Bishop Hobart brought all the weight of his official authority to bear upon him with a view to break up his Friday evening lecture and parish prayer-meetings; but as Dr. Milnor invariably appealed to the canons, it was in vain. Although he closed his lecture with extemporaneous prayer, he was always scrupulous to preface it with reading the liturgical service, which was all the canons required, being silent on the other point. As nothing would stop him short of a regular trial, which he insisted on as his right, and as neither canons nor rubrics were violated, he was left unmolested. The following curious incident will serve to illustrate the nature of the annoyance to which he was subjected:

"At the prayer-meetings, and in his parish, he was not always, nor even generally present; but he countenanced them, and was occasionally in attendance. One evening, while the prayer-meeting was in session, the bishop came to his house; and after the usual statement of objections, desired Dr. Milnor to go and dismiss the assembly. The answer he returned was, in sub-



stance, this: "Bishop, I *dare* not prevent my parishioners from meeting for prayer; but if you are willing to take the responsibility of dismissing them, you have my permission.' Of course, the praying members of St. George's remained undisturbed." p. 631.

What a pitiable situation was this for a pastor to be placed in! Here we see one minister intruding into the parish of another, and dictating to him how he shall feed his flock, and what meetings they shall attend for their spiritual edification, and the pastor at last permitting him to break up the prayer-meeting if he would take the responsibility. This saved him. But if Hobart had had the despotic energy and iron will of a Ravenscroft, and had availed himself of the extorted permission, what melancholy results would have ensued! Ravenscroft would have done it in a minute; for he once unfrocked one of his clergy, simply because he refused to unchurch other Protestant denominations.

Dr. Milnor perfectly understood the crippled position he was compelled to occupy, but he willingly endured every privation and mortification for Christ's sake. Had he been of a different stamp, had he been more pliable, had he consented to join the growing and dominant party of those,

"Who, while they hate the GOSPEL, love THE CHURCH,"

honours would have fallen thick upon him. But he felt sure that his brow was safe from the danger of a mitre, and was well satisfied that it should be so. He said to a friend, joking, on the subject:

"If my Presbyterian brethren made bishops, I might possibly have some chance. But indeed," he more seriously continued, "I have no aspirations on the subject. I have seldom known a presbyter made bishop, whose piety was not, more or less, a sufferer from the elevation. I have little enough as it is." p. 645.

What a pregnant hint is this, coming as it does from such a source! A venerable man, distinguished for his intelligence and candour, deliberately gives it as the result of seventy years' observation, that he had seldom known a person elevated to the office of a bishop, whose piety did not suffer by the change. In this we think we see the noxious, but natural tendency of

Episcopacy. Its favour and its neglect are both fatal. Like the ivy, it stifles what it embraces. If by accident it finds a devout and spiritual man in its ranks, it either corrupts him with its honours, or worries him with its hate. In the latter case, it thwarts or undermines his influence, and thrusts him hopelessly in the shade. If we contemplate the deleterious influence of the system in its subjective aspect, as regards the individual promoted to the episcopate himself, what a fearful commentary have we on the prelatical gloss of that chapter in Timothy which is habitually read in the consecration service! "This is a true saying: if a man *desire* the office of a bishop, he *desireth* a good work." Would the Holy Apostle have spoken of the ambitious minister who coveted a superior station with the vehement and passionate longing and reaching after, which the word "*desire*" implies in the original, and not, by implication at least, have dropped a syllable to discountenance such unsanctified ardour? Would he have unqualifiedly pronounced it "a good work," if its almost invariable tendency was injurious to the piety of every one who aspired to the office? We can easily see the beauty, force, and propriety of the apostle's language on our principles of interpretation, believing him to speak of the bishop of a single congregation; but if he is understood as describing a bishop of bishops, "lording it over God's heritage," the idea is monstrous, and his silence unaccountable.

This excellent man died suddenly, of a disease of the heart, soon after retiring for the night, April 8th, 1845. He was near the opening of his seventy-third year, but to all appearance hale and vigorous. The news of his demise cast a gloom over every Christian heart that was acquainted with his worth. His funeral was attended by numerous clergymen of every denomination, the Board, of the Bible and Tract Societies, and the pupils of the Deaf and Dumb Institution. The funeral address was delivered by Dr. Tyng amidst copious tributes of tears from the vast assemblage. This gentleman was afterwards chosen his successor, and the new rector of St. George's has given ample reason to trust, from his valorous advocacy of evangelical and liberal views, that the mantle of Elijah has fallen on Elisha.

The Memoir by Dr. Stone is published under the auspices of the American Tract Society. There was an obvious propriety

in this, as Dr. Milnor was not only one of the founders of the society, but for years its wise counsellor and steadfast friend. The volume is beautifully got up, and is a handsome tribute to the memory of a great and good man, who, though gifted by nature with neither brilliancy nor genius, yet, by his clearness of intellect, good sense, indefatigable industry, and devoted piety, was made the honoured instrument, under God, of accomplishing an unspeakable amount of good.

---

ART. V.—*Robert Burns ; as a Poet, and as a Man.* By Samuel Tyler, of the Maryland Bar. New York: Baker & Scribner. 1848. pp. 209. 12mo.

WE and our readers have long been familiar with Mr. Tyler's labours as an admiring student, and able expounder of the Baconian Philosophy, with its kindred doctrines in Logic and Metaphysics, and its applications to the argument of Natural Theology. We were taken somewhat by surprise by the publication of the little volume before us, as indicating that, amidst these severer studies, Mr. T. has found time for the culture of lighter literature, and even for paying his court to the Muses. It is very seldom that the same individual attains equal distinction in lines of research and of labour, so different from each other; and we think Mr. T. has not made good an exception to this general remark. The work before is by far the least satisfactory of any thing we have yet seen, from his lucid and generally able pen. It is divided into two parts: the one proposing a new theory of beauty as applied to the art of poetry, and especially as illustrated by the works of Burns; and the other constituting an almost unconditional defence of the Poet in his various relations to society as a man. In both cases, the author fails to carry our convictions by his ingenious reasonings or pleadings, as the case may be; and in both we are so far dissatisfied with his conclusions, as to feel a strong prompting to enter our dissent, not only as a matter of literary judgment, but with something approaching to moral disapprobation.

The hypothesis advocated in this work, as announced with the author's characteristic clearness, is that "the *sublimity* of the material world, is derived from associations with man and his spiritual characteristics; and that the *beauty* of the material world, is derived from associations with woman and her spiritual characteristics." After stating and excepting to the definition which makes "the beautiful to consist in whatever of external nature produces an agreeable impression within us," he adds: "What I mean by the beautiful, is whatever, in the material world, produces impressions within us analogous to those awakened by our intercourse with woman." "In fact, I make woman the spiritual dispenser of beauty to the world." This is sufficiently explicit; and we need hardly say we regard it, not merely like many other hypotheses on this recondite subject, as false philosophy, but as false philosophy sensualized.

The truth, we suppose, is simply this: the healthy exercise of all the faculties of man is attended by a sense of pleasure. This is an ultimate law of our nature, resulting from the beneficence of the Creator. The law of human life includes in it the law of happiness. Now the application of this simple principle to objects of sight, gives rise to the sense of beauty. It includes not only, or even principally, the agreeable sensation attending the mere act of vision as an organic function, but an act of discrimination between the objects or qualities that are adapted to its exercise in the original plan of its formation, and those that are not. It implies, therefore, a preference of one thing over another, grounded originally on the mere fact that it is more agreeable. We are constrained, therefore, to regard the taste, in its last analysis, as an original and ultimate law of our nature, admitting of no explanation except that we were so made; and beauty, pure, material or objective beauty, as a quality which we can only define, by saying that it awakens the pleasures of taste. This is a simple, ultimate fact, for which we can give no reason, any more than why we like the smell of a rose, and dislike that of assafœtida, or why we like the taste of a peach, and dislike that of garlic.

While this is, in our judgment, the true original germ of the faculty of taste as applied to beauty; and the true original foundation of beauty as an objective quality in nature, we are also to remember that the exercise of the taste in man, at least



in all its higher applications, is complex, and includes other elements besides the original and fundamental one just described. All our mental functions are those of intelligent and moral beings. Our intelligence and moral character are implicated in, and modify, all our mental acts. We apprehend truth, not as beings of pure, cold intellect, but as endowed with moral sensibilities: and so the exercise of the taste involves both the intellectual and moral faculties of our nature, because these all inhere, not as distinct ingredients, but as one compound or joint function of the same substantive mind. The human mind is not like a building made up of separate and independent apartments, each of which is appropriated to a separate mental faculty, but like a single chamber, into which light streams through various windows of differently coloured glass. There are not so many distinct images formed by each faculty, but one single image, formed by the blending of the several beams admitted through each aperture. In other words, beauty is never seen through a pure esthetic medium, but a medium that is tinged with the varied hues of human thought and feeling, which emanate from the intellectual and moral nature of the beholder himself. The sense of beauty, as the term is commonly taken, is therefore a highly complex thing. The question, what is beauty, and still more, the question as to the comparative degrees of beauty, depend upon the delicacy, purity, and elevation of thought and feeling in the soul, as well as the intrinsic quality of the object. To one it appears in the neutral tint of unemotional, unimpassioned, and almost unthinking mind. To another it is radiant with ideas of the spiritual and the divine, or coloured with the hues of human sympathy and feeling, flowing from a soul bathed in the knowledge and love of God and of humanity; and to a third it glares before the mental vision in the lurid fires shot from the sensual and earthly passions of a degraded heart. Hence arise, in part, the vast subjective differences of taste among men. In the first case, we have the lowest degree of unperverted taste, or, as near as human nature will admit of such a thing, what should, in strictness of language, be denominated a mere esthetic feeling. In the second, a taste exquisite at once for purity, delicacy, and elevation. And in the last, a taste that is not only low, but erro-

neous and vulgar, capable of appreciating only the most sensual class of beauties.

The strong tendency of the human mind to simplify and generalize, has constantly prompted philosophers to seek for some single element, to the constant presence of which, the manifold beauty of nature may be referred; or failing in this, to reduce the number of its ultimate elements to as few as possible. The attempt to do this has given us the well known analysis of Hogarth, and the familiar hypotheses of Alison, Diderot, Burke, Hume, and Kant. All these hypotheses appear to us to be at fault; first, because they are too restricted and artificial, to satisfy our experience, in contemplating the varied and countless diversities of beauty in the works of nature; and secondly, because they make too little of the ultimate and fundamental fact, that beauty exists, as a quality in natural objects, prior to all association, and independently of the exercise of the intellect on the qualities of proportion, fitness, utility, or multiplicity in unity, or indeed any of those abstract principles of the reason, in which metaphysicians have sought for the foundation of our sense of beauty.

To resolve the beauty of objects in nature into their utility, or the proportion and symmetry of their parts, is to confound things which are entirely distinct, though both productive of a certain sort of pleasure. It is not only to obliterate the taste, as a separate faculty or law of mental action from that by which we perceive the truth and the relations of things, but to obliterate entirely what we mean by beauty, from the works of nature. For it is to us a matter of simple consciousness, that there exists, and that we are capable of appreciating, a certain quality in objects, distinct from their utility or proportion, or any thing else that is the subject of an intellectual judgment.

If any thing be needed to establish this conclusion, beyond a simple appeal to experience, it may easily be found in the fact, that while the relations to which beauty has been referred are a source of agreeable emotion, yet our sense of beauty is by no means in proportion to the degree in which those relations appear; as it should be, if the two things are identical. Hume, with the philosophical acumen which characterises all his works, has shown that all those properties in which the sense of beauty has been sought, may be resolved into a perception

of their utility. But notwithstanding the ingenuity of his analysis, and the plausibility of his reasoning, we apprehend the taste of mankind will persist in discerning more beauty in the tail of a peacock or the plumage of a bird of paradise, than in the pouch of a pelican or the proboscis of an elephant, though the utility of the things are in the inverse ratio to their beauty. And even where the sense of beauty and the sense of utility are both present, and in equal proportions, the two things are clearly distinguished both in their origin and their perception. The taste of Michael Angelo guided by an original intuitive law of its own, projected the arch of the dome of St. Peter's. It was reserved for a mathematician only a few years ago, who was struck by its adaptation to support the immense weight of the dome, by applying the calculus to its measurements, to demonstrate its utility, by showing that it was precisely the arch of greatest strength. The legitimate inference from this coincidence is not that beauty and utility are the same thing, but that the laws of matter, on which its strength depends, were constituted by the same mind which ordained the taste of man, and hence the two are found to be in perfect harmony, though as distinguishable as the fragrance and the flavour of a strawberry or a peach.

The hypotheses of Alison, Burke, and that now propounded by Mr. Tyler, though differing in the most essential respects, agree in this: that they refer the sense of beauty in the objects of nature to the principle of association or suggestion, and not to a law of our being, terminating upon the qualities of the objects themselves. To this assumption our consciousness refuses to answer: and we are persuaded that it is the result of a theory, and not a simple interrogation of experience. To us it seems perfectly clear that the agreeable association of intellectual or moral expression with the forms of beautiful objects in nature, is founded upon a prior and instantaneous apprehension of their intrinsic beauty, instead of the sense of beauty springing out of the association; although, when the association is once established, it becomes, for reasons which we have already explained, a rich and constant source of emotion, tending to enhance the complex sense of what we term beauty. It is the inherent power of the violet, e. g. to awaken an agreeable emotion of a certain kind, as an ultimate fact, that makes it the

emblem of modesty, and not the association with that moral expression, which first awakens our sense of its beauty. All that it is possible for association to do, is to add fresh tints of feeling, or pour more brilliant hues of thought, over the forms of beauty before embodied in the works of nature.

We object, therefore, to the hypothesis of Alison only in part, and that purely on philosophical grounds; but the principle as applied by Mr. Tyler, awakens, as we have said before, a certain feeling bordering on moral disapprobation. It degrades the taste from the rank to which it belongs, if not among the strictly moral faculties of our nature, at least among the refining and elevating ones; and sinks the sense of beauty into the servant of lust. We do not mean to say that, in the conceptions of Mr. T. himself, it has run to that excess; but that such seems to be its tendency and its inevitable result. And we cannot help thinking that even to the feelings of Mr. T. there must be something startling, if not repugnant, in the supposition that there is no beauty in the works of God, but what comes from association with woman. Is there no feeling in the human soul, except the admiration for woman, capable of waking a response from all the vast range of being? Is there no other conception, whether intellectual or moral, capable of projecting an image of beauty in the great mirror of nature? What is it that constitutes woman the sole spiritual dispenser of beauty to the world? If we were disposed to indulge our comic fancy, it would be easy to draw some strange corollaries from this hypothesis, the legitimacy of which it might trouble the author to disprove. If he should attempt to escape what seems to us to be the inevitable tendency of his principles, by assuming that the admiration for woman is due to the extraordinary assemblage of beauties, both physical and moral, which it has pleased the Creator to embody in her constitution, we answer, this is a concession that these elements of female loveliness are beautiful, independently of their embodiment in woman. And if so why may not the same elements of beauty exist in other works of nature? and why may they not be appreciable by the taste, independently of their association with her?

The truth is, Mr. T. has made a false induction, perhaps from too confined a contemplation of the more sensuous beauties of his favourite author. There are two questions which his



intelligent devotion to the Baconian method should have led him to weigh more fully, before proceeding to generalize his law of beauty, viz: 1. Are there not beauties in nature which cannot be brought under this category at all, that cannot be referred to association with the characteristics of woman? 2. Even if it be possible to trace some remote association of the kind, in all the cases of beauty which he is able to find, both in poetry and nature, is it certain that this association is the true source of their power over the taste? Is it not, to say the least, quite as possible that woman owes her power to excite our true and pure admiration, to the possession of such a combination of beauties, physical, intellectual and moral, as that these qualities of person, mind and heart, owe their power over us, and still more their power to irradiate with their beauty the works of nature, including even our conceptions of the higher orders of being, to an instinctive passion for woman, merely as woman.

We have already stated how the apprehension of the objective beauty of nature is modified, when it comes to be blended with the thoughts and feelings of the mind itself. Now it is obvious that this subjective element must be more predominant in that class of beauties which it is the object of poetry, and of art generally, to reproduce. The poet aims not merely to paint the scenes of nature, but to invest them with the thoughts and feelings which they excite in his own mind; and to clothe them with the power of awakening sympathetic emotions in the bosom of others. This is the true aim, and the highest expression, of poetic genius. It is this which lends its fascinations to much of the poetry of Burns. It is not the simple copy of nature, in the Cotter's Saturday Night, or in the still simpler picture of the Mouse's Nest torn up by his plough-share; but the human sensibility, and the human sentiment, which the poet's genius has breathed into those exquisite poems. It follows, therefore, that the highest poetry is not that which most closely imitates nature in its descriptions; but that which suggests the highest thoughts and purest emotions by its pictures of nature. Now if this view be correct, as we are sure it is, and if it be applied as a test of truth to the theory before us, it will show it to be as defective and erroneous in its application to the philosophy of poetry, as we have found it to be, when applied to the original beauty of nature. We most cheerfully

concede to Mr. T. that mere sympathy with humanity in its higher forms, is sufficient to impart high charms to poetry. This is abundantly proved by the literature and art of Pagan Greece and Rome. We also admit, most freely, that these charms are presented in immeasurably greater loveliness, in our purest conceptions of the characteristics of woman, under the refining and elevating influence of Christianity. The poetry of Burns is full of exemplifications of this truth. But surely every one must admit that no one has ever felt the highest power of beauty, who does not see it illumined by a purer light than the spirit of humanity, in its gentlest and loveliest forms can impart;—who does not behold it all radiant with the ineffable glory of God. It is the utterance of the divine, which gives its eloquence to the voice of nature. It is the expression of the divine, which lends its highest effulgence to the beautiful in poetry and art.

If any one should object that the highest sensibility and the purest taste are sometimes found in the case of those who are morally estranged from the knowledge and sympathy of God, we reply that it is not necessary that this principle should be distinctly understood, and still less acknowledged, in order to make its power felt. God has endowed the workmanship of his hands with the power of impressing us with the sense of his presence, even though we may not know that it is his presence which we feel; just as we walk and see at night by the light of the sun diffused by reflection throughout our system even when the sun itself is not visible. Or we may be awed by the knowledge that the sounds of nature are the voice of God, and the works of nature instinct with the thoughts of God, even though we may not understand their precise import. Like inscriptions found upon rocks in some unknown character, we may feel that they utter some burden of human thought and feeling, though we may not be able to decypher their mysterious meanings. But after all, it is our firm belief that there is no degree of sensibility to beauty, and no power of imagination to penetrate and reveal the secrets of nature, which the illumination of true piety would not exalt and strengthen. Great as human taste and human genius often are, because they retain the blind, instinctive sympathies with which they are endowed by the very act of creation, they would be rendered greater still,

by intelligent and intimate communion with the great source of all true light and beauty.

In regard to the second part of the task which Mr. Tyler proposes, viz: to vindicate the moral and social character of Burns, we have only to say, that we fear his just admiration of the poet, has seduced him into an undue approbation of the man; or rather, perhaps, into excessive lenity in handling the notorious vices of his private life. This, however, is a topic for the discussion of which we have neither the time nor the taste.

---

ART. VI—*God in Christ; Three Discourses delivered at New Haven, Cambridge, and Andover; with a Preliminary Dissertation on Language.* By Horace Bushnell. Hartford: Brown & Parsons. 1849. pp. 356.

THE doctrines of the Trinity, Incarnation, and Atonement, are the common property of Christians. They belong to no sect and to no country. Any assault upon them, any explanation or defence of them, is matter of general interest. These doctrines are discussed in the volume now before us. It is addressed, therefore, to the whole Christian public, and not exclusively to New England. On this account we are disposed to call the attention of our readers to its contents. We are the more inclined to take this course, because the character of the work, and the peculiar circumstances of its origin, are likely to secure for it an extensive circulation. We hardly think, indeed, that it will produce the sensation which many seem to expect. Dr. Bushnell says: "Some persons anticipate, in the publication of these 'Discourses,' the opening of another great religious controversy." This expectation he does not himself entertain, because he says, "I am quite resolved that I will be drawn into no reply, unless there is produced against me some argument of so great force, that I feel myself required, out of simple duty to the truth, either to surrender or to make important modifications in the views I have advanced. I anticipate, of course, no such necessity, though I do anticipate that arguments,

and reviews, very much in the character of that which I just now gave myself, will be advanced—such as will show off my absurdities in a very glaring light, and such as many persons of acknowledged character will accept with applause, as conclusive, or even explosive refutations. Therefore I advertise it beforehand, to prevent a misconstruction of my silence, that I am silenced now, on the publication of my volume.”

This passage clearly indicates that an effect is expected from these discourses, such as few sermons have ever produced. We are disposed to doubt as to this point. We should be sorry to think that the public mind is in such an unhealthy state, as to be much effected by any thing contained in this volume. Every thing from Dr. Bushnell has indeed a certain kind of power. His vigorous imagination, and his adventurous style, cannot fail to command attention. There is in this book a great deal of truth pungently presented; and there are passages of exquisite beauty of thought and expression. Still, with reverence be it spoken, we think the book a failure. In the first place, it settles nothing. It overturns, but it does not erect. Men do not like to be houseless; much less do they like to have the doctrines which overhang and surround their souls as a dwelling and refuge, pulled to pieces, that they may sit sentimentally on the ruins. If Dr. Bushnell takes from us our God and our Redeemer, he is bound to provide some adequate substitute. He has done no such thing. He rejects the old doctrine of the Trinity and Incarnation; but he has produced no other intelligible doctrine. He has not thought himself through. He is only half out of the shell. And therefore his attempt to soar is premature. He rejects the doctrine of three persons in one God. He says: “It seems to be agreed by the orthodox, that there are three persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in the divine nature.” This he denies, and argues against. pp. 130–136. In opposition to such a Trinity, he presents and urges the doctrine of a historical Trinity, a threefold revelation of God. But then, the old house down, and the new not keeping out the rain, and tottering under even the builder’s solitary tread, he tries (though too late, except as an acknowledgment of failure) to re-construct the old. What Trinitarian wishes more, or can say more than Dr. Bushnell says on p. 174: “Neither is it any so great wisdom, as many theologians appear to fancy, to object



to the word *person*; for, if any thing is clear, it is that the Three of Scripture do appear under the grammatic forms which are appropriate to person—I, Thou, He, We, and They; and, if it be so, I really do not perceive the very great license taken by our theology, when they are called three persons. Besides, we practically need, for our own sake, to set them out as three persons before us, acting relatively towards each other, in order to ascend into the liveliest, fullest realization of God. We only need to abstain from assigning to these divine persons an interior, metaphysical nature, which we are nowise able to investigate, and which we may positively know to contradict the real unity of God." To all this we say, Amen. Then what becomes of his arguments against three persons in the divine nature? What becomes of his cheating mirage of a trinity—a trinity of revelations? He takes away the doctrine on which the spiritual life of every Christian rests, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and gives us "a God historically three;" and then admits that the Scriptures teach, and that we need, a God personally three! Dr. Bushnell cannot reasonably expect to convert others until he has completed the conversion of himself.

This half-ism is manifested also in what he says of the person of Christ, pp. 158—167. He presents all the usual objections against the assumption of a two-fold nature in the Redeemer. He insists that it is God that appears under the limitations of humanity, and that of the divine nature is to be predicated the ignorance, subordination and suffering ascribed to Christ. He commits himself fully to the Apollinarian view of Christ's person. And then his heart or his conscience smites him. His unsteady head again reels, and he gives it all up. When categorically demanded, whether he renounces the divine and life-giving doctrine of God and man, in two distinct natures and one person, he falters, and says: "It may be imagined that I intend, in holding this view of the incarnation, or of the person of Christ, to deny that he had a human soul, or any thing human but a human body, I only deny that his human soul, or nature, is to be spoken of or looked upon, as having a distinct subsistence." p. 168. But this we all deny. Who ever heard of "two distinct subsistences" in Christ? If Dr. Bushnell has got no further than this, he has not got beyond his Catechism.

For it is there taught there is but one subsistence, one *suppositum intelligens*, one person in Christ. He returns, however, to his *εἰδωλον*, to his Christ without a soul, a Christ who is no Christ, almost on the next page. We do not gain anything, he says, "by supposing a distinct human soul in the person of Christ, connecting itself with what are called the humanities of Christ. Of what so great consequence to us are the humanities of a mere human soul." p. 156. This saying and unsaying betrays a man who is not sure of his ground. People will never confide in a leader, who does not confide in himself. Dr. Bushnell has undertaken a task for which he is entirely incompetent. He has not the learning, the knowledge of opinions or forms of doctrine; nor has he the philosophical culture, nor the constructive intellect, required to project a consistent and comprehensive theory on the great themes of God, the Incarnation and Redemption. We say this with no disrespect. We would say it with tenfold readiness of ourselves. We have the advantage of our author, however, in having sense enough to know that our sphere is a much humbler one. Machiavelli was accustomed to say, there are three classes of men; one who see things in their own light; another who see them when they are shown; and a third who cannot see them even then. We invite Dr. Bushnell to resume his place with us, in the second class. By a just judgment of God, those who uncalled aspire to the first, lapse into the third.

The characteristic, to which we have referred, is not so strongly marked in the discourse on the atonement. Here alas! the writer has been able to emancipate himself more completely from the teachings of the nursery, the Bible and the Spirit. Yet even here, there is that yearning after the old and scriptural, that desire to save something from the wreck of his former faith, which excites respectful commiseration. There are but three radical views of the atonement, properly so called. The scriptural doctrine, which represents it as a real propitiation; the governmental view, which makes it a method of teaching symbolically the justice of God; the Socinian view, which regards it as designed to produce a subjective effect, to impress men with a sense of God's love &c. Dr. Bushnell spurns the first, rejects the second, and adopts the third. But then he finds that he has lost every thing worth retaining, and therefore endeavours

to regain the first which, he calls, the "Altar view." His "constructive logic" will not allow his holding it as truth, he therefore endeavours to hold it as "form." He cannot retain it as doctrine, but he clings to it as "art." He admits that it is the scriptural view; that the whole church has adhered to it as to the source of life, and that it is the only effective view. "Christ," he says, "is a power for the moral renovation of the world, and as such is measured by what he expresses." How is this renovation effected? Not by his offering himself as a propitiation for our sins, and thus reconciling us to God, and procuring for us the gift of the Holy Ghost, but "by his obedience, by the expense and pains taking of his suffering life, by yielding up his own sacred person to die, he has produced in us a sense of the eternal sanctity of God's law that was needful to prevent the growth of license or of indifference and insensibility to religious obligations, such as must be incurred, if the exactness and rigour of a law system were wholly dissipated, by offers of pardon grounded in mere leniency." This is really what Christ does. This is his atoning work. He produced a sense of the sanctity of the law in us. This is full out the Socinian view of the doctrine. But, says Dr. Bushnell, it has no power in this abstract form. "We must transfer this subjective state or impression, this ground of justification, and produce it outwardly, if possible, in some objective form; *as if it* had some effect on the law or on God. The Jew had done this before us, and we follow him; representing Christ as our sacrifice, sin-offering, atonement, sprinkling of blood. . . . . These forms are the objective equivalents of our subjective impressions. Indeed, our impressions have their life and power in and under these forms. Neither let it be imagined that we only happen to seize upon these images of sacrifice, atonement, and blood, because they are at hand. They are prepared, as God's form of art, for the representation of Christ and his work; and if we refuse to let him pass into this form, we have no mold of thought which can fitly represent him. And when he is thus represented, we are to understand that he is our sacrifice and atonement, that by his blood we have remission, not in any speculative sense, but as in art." p. 254. The plain meaning of this is; that the actual thing done is the production of a certain subjective change, or impression in us. This

impression cannot be produced in any way so effectively as by what Christ has done. As a work of art produces an impression more powerful than a formula; so Christ viewed as a sacrifice, as a ransom, as a propitiation, produces the impression of the sanctity of the law more powerfully than any didactic statement of its holiness could do. It is in this "artistic" form that the truth is effectually conveyed to the mind. This mode is admitted to be essential. Vicarious atonement, sacrifice, sin-offering, propitiation is declared to be "the DIVINE FORM of Christianity, in distinction from all others, and is, in that view, substantial to it, or consubstantial with it." "It is obvious," he adds, "that all the most earnest Christian feelings of the apostles are collected round this objective representation, the vicarious sacrifice of Christ, for the sins of the world. They speak of it, not casually . . . but systematically, they live in it, their Christian feeling is measured by it, and shaped in the molds it offers." p. 259. We do not consider this assertion of the absolute necessity of Christ's being presented as a sacrifice, or this admission that his work is set forth as a vicarious atonement in the Scriptures, as a formal retraction or contradiction of the author's speculative view of the real nature of the Redeemer's work; but we do consider it sufficient to convince any rational man, that that speculative view is an inanity, a lifeless notion, the bloodless progeny of a poetic imagination. Few persons will believe that the life and death of Christ was a mere liturgical service, a chant and a dirge, to move "the world's mind;" a pageant with a moral.

These discourses, then, unless we are sadly deceived as to the amount of religious knowledge and principle in the public mind, must fail to produce any great impression. They lack the power of consistency. They say and unsay. They pull down, and fail to rebuild. What they give is in no proportion to what they take away. Besides this, their power is greatly impaired by the mixture of incongruous elements in their composition. Rationalism, Mysticism and the new Philosophy are shaken together, but refuse to combine. The staple of the book is rationalistic, the other elements are adventitious. They have been too recently imbibed to be properly assimilated. Either of these elements by itself has an aspect more or less respectable. It is the combination that is grotesque. A mystic



Rationalist is very much like a Quaker dragoon. As, however, we prefer faith without knowledge, to knowledge without faith, we think the mysticism an improvement. We rejoice to see that Dr. Bushnell, even at the expense of consistency and congruity, sometimes lapses into the passive mood of a recipient of truth through some other channel than the discursive understanding.

The new Philosophy, which gleams in lurid streaks through this volume, is still more out of place. We meet here and there with transcendental principles and expressions, which, even "the deepest chemistry of thought," (the solvent by which he proposes to make all creeds agree, p. 82,) must fail to bring into combination with the pervading Theism of the book. The proof of the presence of all these incongruous elements in these discourses, is patent to every one who reads them. In our subsequent remarks we hope to make it sufficiently plain even to those who read only this review. Our present object is merely to indicate this characteristic as a source of weakness. Had Dr. Bushnell chosen to set forth a consistent exhibition of all that the mere understanding has to say against the doctrines of the Trinity, Incarnation, and Atonement; or had he chosen to give us the musings of a poetical mystic; or had he even endeavoured to reproduce the system of Hegel or Schleiermacher, we doubt not he would have made a book of considerable power. But the attempt to play so many incongruous parts at one time, in our poor judgment, has made the failure as complete as it was inevitable.

The extravagance of the book is another of its characteristics which must prevent its having much effect. Every thing permanently influential is moderate. But Dr. Bushnell is extravagant even to paradox. This disposition is specially manifested in the preliminary dissertation on language, and in the discourse on dogma. There is nothing either new or objectionable, in his general theory of language. The whole absurdity and evil lie in the extravagant length to which he carries his principles. It is true, for example, that there are two great departments of language, the physical and intellectual, or proper and figurative, the language of sensation and the language of thought. It is also true that the latter is to a great extent borrowed from the former. It is true, moreover,

that the language of thought is in a measure symbolical and suggestive, and therefore of necessity more or less inadequate. No words can possibly answer accurately to the multiplied, diversified and variously implicated states of mind to which they are applied. In all cases it is only an approximation. Something is always left unexpressed, and something erroneous always is, or may be, included in the terms employed. Dr. Bushnell, after parading these principles with great circumstance, presses them out to the most absurd conclusions. Because language is an imperfect vehicle of thought, no dependence can be placed upon it; there can be no such thing as a scientific theology; no definite doctrinal propositions; creeds and catechisms are not to be trusted; no author can be properly judged by his words, etc., etc. See pp. 72, 79, 82, 91, et seq., and the discourse on dogma *passim*. As creeds mean nothing or any thing, he is willing to sign any number of them. He has never been able, he says, "to sympathise, at all, with the abundant protesting of the New England historians, against creeds. So far from suffering even the least consciousness of restraint, or oppression, under any creed I have been the readier to accept as great a number as fell in my way; for when they are subjected to the deepest chemistry of thought, that which descends to the point of relationship between the form of the truth and its interior formless nature, they become, thereupon so elastic, and run so freely into each other, that one seldom need have any difficulty in accepting as many as are offered him." p. 82. This is shocking. It undermines all confidence even in the ordinary transactions of life. There can, on this plan, be no treaties between nations, no binding contracts between individuals; for "the chemistry" which can make all creeds alike, will soon get what results it pleases out of any form of words that can be framed. This doctrine supposes there can be no revelation from God to men, except to the imagination and the feelings, none to the reason. It supposes that man, by the constitution of his nature is such a failure, that he cannot certainly communicate or receive thought. The fallacy of all Dr. Bushnell's reasoning on this subject, is so transparent, that we can hardly give him credit for sincerity. Because by words a man cannot express every thing that is in his mind, the inference is that he can express nothing surely; because,

each particular word may be figurative and inadequate, it is argued that no number or combination of words, no variety of illustration, nor diversity in the mode of setting forth the same truth, can convey it certainly to other minds. He confounds moreover knowing every thing that may be known of a given subject, with understanding any definite proposition respecting it. Because there is infinitely more in God, than we can ever find out, therefore the proposition, God is a Spirit, gives us no definite knowledge, and may as well be denied as affirmed! His own illustration on this point is the proposition, "Man thinks," which, he says, has "a hundred different meanings." Admitting that the subject "man," in this proposition, may be viewed very variously, and that the nature and laws of the process of thought predicated of him, are very doubtful matters, this does not throw the smallest obscurity or ambiguity over the proposition itself. It conveys a definite notion, to every human being. It expresses clearly a certain amount of truth, a fact of consciousness, which within certain limits is understood by every human being exactly alike. Beyond those limits there may be indefinite diversity. But this does not render the proposition ambiguous. The man who should reverse the assertion, and say, "man does not think," would be regarded as an idiot though the greatest mental chemist of the age. This doctrine that language can convey no specific, definite truth to the understanding, which Dr. Bushnell uses to loosen the obligation of creeds, is all the sceptic needs, to destroy the authority of the Bible; and all the Jesuit requires to free himself from the trammels of common veracity. The practical difference between believing all creeds and believing none, is very small.

What our author says of logic is marked with the same extravagance. It is true that the understanding out of its legitimate sphere, is a perfectly untrustworthy guide. When it applies its categories to the infinite, or endeavours to subject the incomprehensible to its modes, it must necessarily involve itself in contradictions. It is easy, therefore, to make any statement relating to the eternity, the immensity, or will, of God, involve the appearance of inward conflict. From this Dr. Bushnell infers (i. e. when speaking as a mystic) that logic and the understanding are to be utterly discarded from the whole sphere of religion; that the revelations of God are not addressed to the

reason, but to the esthetic principles of our nature; and that a thing's being absurd, is no proof that it is not true. Nay, the more absurd the better. He glories in the prospect of the harvest of contradictions and solecisms, the critics are to gather from his book. He regards them as so many laurels plucked for the wreath that is to adorn his brows. That we may not be suspected of having caught a little of the Dr.'s extravagance, we beg the reader to turn to such passages as the following: "Probably the most contradictory book in the world is the Gospel of John; and that for the very reason that it contains more and loftier truths than any other." p. 57. "There is no book in the world that contains so many repugnances, or antagonistic forms of assertion, as the Bible. Therefore, if any man please to play off his constructive logic upon it, he can easily show it up as absurdest book in the world." p. 69. "I am perfectly well aware that my readers can run me into just what absurdity they please. Nothing is more easy. I suppose it might be almost as easy for me to do it as for them. Indeed, I seem to have the whole argument which a certain class of speculators must raise upon my Discourses, in order to be characteristic, fully before me. I see the words footing it along to their conclusions. I see the terrible syllogisms wheeling out their infantry on my fallacies and absurdities." p. 106. He laughs at syllogisms as a ghost would at a musket. Syllogisms are well enough in their place; but the truth he teaches is perfectly consistent with absurdity, and therefore cannot be hurt by being proved to be absurd. He says: "There may be solid, living, really consistent truth in the views I have offered, considering the trinity and atonement as addressed to feeling and imagination, when, considered as addressed to logic, there is only absurdity and confusion in them." p. 108. The Incarnation and Trinity "offer God, not so much to the reason, or logical understanding, as to the imagination, and the perceptive or esthetic apprehension of faith." p. 102. They are to be accepted, he elsewhere says, as addressed "to feeling and imaginative reason,"—not "as metaphysical entities for the natural understanding." p. 111.

It is among the first principles of the oracle of God, that regeneration and sanctification are not esthetic effects produced through the imagination. They are moral and spiritual changes, wrought by the Holy Ghost, with and by the truth as revealed



to the reason. The whole healthful power of the things of God over the feelings, depends upon their being true to the intellect. If we are affected by the revelation of God as a father, it is because he is a father, and not the picture of one. If we have peace through faith in the blood of Christ, it is because he is a propitiation for our sins in reality, and not in artistic form merely. The Bible is not a cunningly devised fable—a work of fiction, addressed to the imagination. It would do little for the poor and the homeless, to entertain them with a picture of Elysium. It would not heal a leper or a cripple, to allow him to gaze on the Apollo; nor will it comfort or sanctify a convinced sinner, to set before him any sublime imaginings concerning God and atonement. The revelations of God are addressed to the whole soul, to the reason, to the imagination, to the heart, and to the conscience. But unless they are true to the reason, they are as powerless as a phantasm.

Dr. Bushnell makes no distinction between knowing and understanding. Because it is not necessary that the objects of faith should be understood, (i. e. comprehended in their nature and relations,) he infers that they need not be known. Because God is incomprehensible, our conceptions of him may be absurd and contradictory! This is as much as to say, that because there are depths and vastnesses in the stellar universe which science cannot penetrate; nebulae which no telescope can resolve, therefore we may as rationally believe the cosmogony of the Hindus as the *Mécanique Céleste*. It is plain the poetic element in Dr. Bushnell's constitution has so completely swallowed up the rational and moral, he can see only through the medium of the imagination. Through that medium all things are essentially the same. Different creeds present to his eye, "in a fine frenzy rolling," only the various patterns of a kaleidoscope. It may be well enough for him to amuse himself with that pretty toy; but it is a great mistake to publish what he sees as discoveries, as though a kaleidoscope were a telescope.

As one other illustration of our author's spirit of exaggeration, we would refer to what he says of his responsibility for his opinions. No man will deny that we are all in a measure passive in the reception of any system of doctrine; that the circumstances of our birth and education, and the manifold in-

fluences of our peculiar studies and associations, and especially (as to all good) of the Spirit of God, determine, in a great measure, our whole intellectual and moral state. But under these *ab extra* influences, and mingling with them, is the mysterious operations of our spontaneous and voluntary nature, yielding or opposing, choosing or rejecting, so that our faith becomes the most accurate image and criterion of our inner man. We are what we believe; our faith is the expression of our true moral character, and is the highest manifestation of our inward self. We are more responsible, therefore, for our faith than even for our acts; for the latter are apt to be impulsive, while the former is the steady index of the soul, pointing God-ward or earth-ward. Dr. Bushnell, however, pushes the admitted fact that outward and inward influences have so much power over men, to the extent of denying all responsibility for his opinions. "I seem," he says, "with regard to the views presented, to have had only about the same agency in forming them, that I have in preparing the blood I circulate, and the anatomic frame I occupy. They are not my choice or invention, so much as a necessary growth, whose process I can hardly trace myself. And now, in giving them to the public, I seem only to have about the same kind of option left me that I have in the matter of appearing in corporal manifestation myself—about the same anxiety, I will add, concerning the unfavourable judgments to be encountered; for though a man's opinions are of vastly greater moment than his looks, yet, if he is equally simple in them, as in his growth, and equally subject to his law, he is responsible only in the same degree, and ought not, in fact, to suffer any greater concern about their reception than about the judgment passed upon his person." p. 98.

Hence the sublime confidence expressed on p. 116: "The truths here uttered are not mine. They live in their own majesty. . . . If they are rejected universally, then I leave them to time, as the body of Christ was left, believing that after three days they rise again." We venture to predict that these days will turn out to be demiurgic.

All we have yet said respecting the characteristics of these Discourses might be true, and yet their general tendency be good. It is conceivable that a book may pull down rather than construct; that its materials may be incongruous, and its tone exaggerated,

and yet its principles and results be in the main correct. This, we are sorry to say, is very far from being the case, with regard to the volume now before us. Its principles and results are alike opposed to the settled faith of the Christian world. This we shall endeavour, as briefly as possible, to demonstrate.

We have already said that the spirit of this book is rationalistic. The Rationalism which we charge on Dr. Bushnell is not that of the Deists, which denies any higher source of truth than human reason. Nor is it that rationalism which will receive nothing except on rational grounds; which admits the truths of revelation only because they can be proved from reason, though not discovered by it. The charge is, that he unduly exalts the authority of reason as a judge of the contents of an admitted revelation. All men, do, of necessity, either expressly or by implication, admit that reason has a certain judicial authority in matters of faith. This arises from God's being the author both of reason and revelation. And he has so constituted our nature, that it is impossible for us to believe contradictions. We may believe things which we cannot reconcile; but we cannot believe any proposition which affirms and denies the same thing. Contradictions, however, are carefully to be distinguished both from things merely incomprehensible, and from those which are not made evident to us, and which, for the time being, we cannot believe. A contradiction is seen to be such, as soon as the terms in which it is expressed are understood. That a thing is and is not; that the whole is less than one of its parts; that sin is holiness; that one person is three persons, or two persons are one, are at once, and by all men, seen to be impossibilities. A contradiction cannot be true, what is incomprehensible may be. Its being incomprehensible may depend on our ignorance or weakness of intellect. What is incomprehensible to a child is often perfectly intelligible to a man. While, therefore, we cannot be required to believe contradictions, we are commanded to believe, at the peril of salvation, much that we cannot understand.

Men often confound these two classes of things, and reject as contradictory what is merely incomprehensible. This, however, is rationalism; it is an abuse of the *judicium contradictionis* which belongs to reason. It is a still more common form of rationalism to reject doctrines because they are distasteful, or

because they conflict with our opinions or prejudices. Of such rationalism the church is full. Men's likes and dislikes are, after all, in a multitude of cases, their true rule of faith.

It is with both these forms of rationalism we think Dr. Bushnell's book is chargeable. With him the questions respecting the Trinity and Incarnation are not questions of scriptural interpretation. He scarcely, especially as to the former, deigns to ask, what does the Bible teach. The whole subject is submitted to "the constructive logic." Can the church doctrine, on these points, be reduced under the categories of the understanding? This, with Dr. B., is the great question. Because he cannot see how there can be three persons in the same divine substance, he pronounces it to be impossible. He admits that the Scriptures appear to teach this doctrine; nay, that we are forced to conceive of God as triune, to answer our own inward necessities; but there stands Logic, saying, It cannot be so, and he believes Logic rather than God; not observing, alas! that Logic, in this case, is only Dr. Bushnell. It may, indeed, be asked, how are we to tell what is a contradiction? Or what right have we to call a man a rationalist for rejecting a doctrine which appears to him to contradict reason? We answer: all real self-contradictions are self-evidently such. Of necessity, the responsibility in such cases is a personal one. If one man denies the existence of a personal God, another the responsibility of man, another divine providence, on the ground that these doctrines contradict reason, they act at their peril. It is nevertheless both the right and the duty of all Christians to denounce, as the manifestation of a rationalistic spirit, all rejection of the plain doctrines of the Scripture as self-contradictory and absurd. Such condemnation is involved in their continued faith in the Bible as a revelation of God.

If the church doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation are rejected in this volume on the ground that they involve contradictions, the doctrine of atonement is no less evidently repudiated because the author does not like it. It offends his feelings, or, as he supposes, his "correct moral sentiments;" just as the scriptural doctrine of future punishment offends the moral sentiments of Universalists. His objections are not derived from Scripture. They are the cavils of the understanding or of offended feeling. When arguments of this sort are exhaust-



ed, he is perfectly bankrupt, and, as is too apt to be the case with bankrupts, he then turns dishonest. We hardly know where to look for a more uncandid representation of the church doctrine, than is to be found on pp. 196, 197. This is the more inexcusable, as Dr. B. himself admits that it is under those very forms of sin-offering and propitiation, the work of Christ is set forth in the scriptures; and it is to those forms he attributes all its power. But it is a contradiction to say that Christ's death under the form of a propitiation, can be effective as an expression of good, if his being an actual propitiation, is offensive. If the reality is horrible, the representation cannot be beauty. As well might the Gorgonian head be used to subdue the world to love.

But if rationalism is Dr. Bushnell's sword, mysticism is his shield. So long as he is attacking, no man makes more of the "constructive logic;" but as soon as the logic is brought to bear against himself, he turns saint, and is wrapt in contemplation. He wonders people should expect a poem to prove any thing; or require any thing so beautiful as religion to be true. He is like one of those fighting priests of the middle ages, who, so long as there was any robbing to be done, were always in the saddle; but as soon as the day of reckoning came, pleaded loudly their benefit of clergy.

There are several kinds of mysticism; and as Dr. B. recommends both Neander and Madame Guyon, who differ *toto cœlo*, it is difficult to say which he means to adopt; or whether, as is his wont, he means to believe them all. In the general, mysticism is faith in an immediate, continued, supernatural, divine operation on the soul, effecting a real union with God, and attainable only by a passive waiting or inward abstraction and rest. The divine influence or operation, assumed in mysticism, differs from the scriptural doctrine concerning the work of the Spirit, as the former is assumed to be a continued, immediate influence, instead of with and by the truth. The scriptures do indeed teach that, in the moment of regeneration, the Spirit of God acts directly on the soul, but they do not inculcate any such continued direct operation as mysticism supposes. After regeneration, all the operations of the Spirit are in connexion with the word; and the effects of his influence are always rational—i. e. they involve an intellectual apprehension of the

truth, revealed in the scriptures. The whole inward life, thus induced, is therefore dependent on the written word and conformed to it. It is no vague ecstasy of feeling, or spiritual inebriation, in which all vision is lost, of which the Spirit of truth is the author, but a form of life in which the illuminated intellect informs and controls the affections. Neither is mysticism to be confounded with inspiration. The latter is an influence on the reason, revealing truth or guiding the intellectual operations of the mind. Mysticism makes the feelings the immediate subject of this divine impression, and the intellect to be rather indirectly influenced. The idea of an immediate operation of God on the soul is so prominent in mysticism, that Luther calls the Pope the Great Mystic, because of his claim to perpetual inspiration, or supernatural guidance of the Spirit, independent of the word.\*

A second form of mysticism is that which places religion entirely in the feelings, excited by the presence of God, and makes doctrine of very subordinate moment. It is not the intellect that is relied upon to receive truth as presented in the word, but a spiritual insight is assumed, a direct intuition of the things of God. This again is very different from the scriptural doctrine of divine illumination. The latter supposes the Spirit to open the eyes of the mind to see the things freely given to us by God in the word. It is only the spiritual discernment of the things of the Spirit revealed in the scriptures, to which this illumination leads. But the intuitions of the mystic are above and apart from the word, and of higher authority. The letter kills him; the inward sense discerned by a holy instinct, gives him life. Besides the forms above mentioned, there is a philosophical mysticism, which scientifically evolves doctrine out of feeling. Instead of making the objective in religion control the subjective, it does the reverse. It admits no doctrines but such as are supposed to be the intellectual expressions of Christian feeling. To this doubtless Neander, as a friend and pupil of Schleiermacher, the author of this theory, is more or less inclined. The term mysticism is used in a still wider sense. The assertion,

\* Quid? quod etiam Papatus simpliciter est merus entusiasmus, quo Papa gloriatur, omnia jura esse in scrinio sui pectoris, et quidquid ipse in ecclesia sua sentit et jubet, id spiritum et justum esse, etiamsi supra et contra scripturam et vocale verbum aliquid statuatur et præcipiatur. Articuli Smalcaldici P. iii. 8.

that religion is not a mere matter of the intellect, a mere philosophy, or that there is more in it than a correct creed and moral life, has been, and often is, called mysticism. This, however, is merely a protest against rationalism, or formal, traditional, and lifeless orthodoxy. In this sense all evangelical Christians are mystics. This is a mere abuse of the term.

It is obvious that mysticism, properly so called, in all its forms, makes little of doctrine. It has a source of knowledge higher than the scriptures. The life of God in the soul is assumed to be as informing now as in the case of the apostles. The scriptures, therefore, are not needed, and they are not regarded, as either the ground or rule of faith. The ordinary means of grace are of still less importance. The church is nothing. The spiritual life of the soul is not preserved by the ordinances of God, but by isolation and quietism. By this neglect of scripture the door is opened for all sorts of vagaries to usurp the place of truth. And the kind of religion thus fostered is either a poetic sentimentalism or a refined sensualism, which becomes less and less refined the longer it is indulged. Dr. Bushnell must remember that he is not the first mystic by a great many thousands, and that this whole tendency, of which he has become the advocate and exemplar, has left its melancholy traces in the history of the church.

The position of our author, in reference to this subject, is to be learned, partly from his direct assertions, partly from the general spirit of his book, and partly from the fruits or results of the system, so far as they are here avowed. We can refer to little more than some of his most explicit declarations on the subject. On p. 92, he complains of "the theologic method of New England" as being essentially rationalistic. "The possibility of reasoning out religion, though denied in words, has been tacitly assumed. . . . It has not been held as a practical, positive, and earnest Christian truth, that there is a PERCEPTIVE POWER in spiritual life, an unction of the Holy One, which is itself a kind of inspiration—an immediate, experimental knowledge of God, by virtue of which, and partly in the degree of which, Christian theology is possible."

In opposition to the rationalistic method, as he considers it, "The views of language, here offered," he says, "lead to a different method. The scriptures will be more studied than they

have been, and in a different manner—not as a magazine of propositions and mere dialectic entities, but as inspirations and poetic forms of life; requiring, also, divine inbreathings and exaltations in us, that we may ascend into their meaning. Our opinions will be less catechetical and definite, using the word as our definers do, but they will be as much broader as they are more divine; as much truer, as they are more vital and closer to the plastic, undefinable mysteries of spiritual life. We shall seem to understand less and shall actually receive more. We shall delight in truth, more as a concrete, vital nature, incarnated in all fact and symbol round us—a vast, mysterious, incomprehensible power, which best we know, when most we love.” “A mystic,” he says, “is one who finds a secret meaning, both in words and things, back of their common and accepted meaning—some agency of LIFE or of LIVING THOUGHT, hid under the forms of words and institutions, and historical events.” He quotes Neander as saying that the apostle John “exhibits all the incidents of the outward history of Christ, only as a manifestation of his indwelling glory, by which this may be brought home to the heart. . . . John is the representative of the truth which lies at the basis of that tendency of the Christian spirit, which sets itself in opposition to a one-sided intellectualism, and ecclesiastical formality—and is distinguished by the name mysticism.” p. 95. “I make no disavowal,” adds our author, “that there is a mystic element, as there should be, in what I have represented as the source of language, and, also, in the views of Christian life and doctrine that follow.” On page 347, he recommends to Christian ministers and students of theology “that they make a study, to some extent, of the mystic and quietistic writers.” Besides these distinct avowals, the main design of the book manifests the writer’s position. His great object is to prove that positive doctrines have no authority; that the revelations of God are addressed to the imagination, and not to the reason; that their truth lies in what they express. The work of Christ, he says, “Is more a poem than a treatise. It classes as a work of Art more than as a work of science. It addresses the understanding, in great part, through the feeling or sensibility. In these it has its receptivities, by these it is perceived, or is perceivable.” p. 204. It is as a mystic he pours forth his whole tirade against theology, catechisms and creeds. It is not by truth, but by



merging all differences of doctrine, in esthetic emotions, that religion is to be revived, and all Christians are to be united. It is not the philosophical mysticism of Neander, which makes havoc enough of the doctrines of the Bible, which this volume advocates; but a mere poetic sentimentalism. The author would provide a crucible in which all Christian truth is to be sublimated. To the mystic the Bible is a mere picture book; and Christian ordinances absolutely nothing. We have accordingly in this volume a discourse on the "True reviving of Religion," in which there is not one word said of the importance of doctrinal truth, or of the means of grace, or of the work of the Holy Spirit. Its whole drift is to show that doctrine, stigmatized as "dogma," is human, and lifeless, and that immediate insight, "the perceptive power" of the inner life, is the true source of all those views of divine things, which are really operative, and that the great means of attaining those views, and of bringing the soul into union with God, is Quietism.

The main objection to this book, however, has not yet been stated. Some men have been as rationalistic, and others as mystical as Dr. Bushnell, who have nevertheless held fast the great doctrines of the gospel; whereas Dr. Bushnell discards them, and substitutes the phantoms of his own imagination in their place. This is plainly the case with regard to the doctrine of the Trinity. The course which the church has pursued in reference to this, and similar doctrines, is to make a careful collation of all the scriptural facts relating to the subject, and then to frame a statement of those facts, which shall avoid any contradiction, either of itself and of other revealed truths. Such statement is then the church doctrine as to that subject. The doctrine does not profess to be an explanation of the facts, nor a reconciliation of them, but simply a statement of them, free from contradiction, which is to be received on the authority of God. The essential facts contained in scripture concerning the Trinity are: 1. There is but one God; one divine being, nature, or substance. 2. That to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, divine titles, attributes, works and worship are ascribed. 3. That the Father, Son and Spirit are so distinguished, the one from the other, that each is the source and the object of action; the Father loves and sends the Son; the Son loves and reveals the Father; the Spirit testifies of the Son and

is sent by him. The personal pronouns, I, Thou, He, are used to express this distinction. The Father says Thou, to the Son; and the Son says Thou, to the Father. Both, speaking of the Spirit, says He or Him. All this is done not casually, occasionally, or rhetorically, but uniformly, solemnly, and didactically. 4. The Father, Son, and Spirit are represented as doing, each a specific work, and all coöperating, outwardly and inwardly in the redemption of man; and we are required to perform specific duties which terminate on each. We are to look to the Father as our Father, to the Son as our Redeemer, to the Spirit as our Paraclete. We are bound to acknowledge each; as we are baptized in the name of the Son and Spirit, as well as in the name of the Father. We believe in the Son, as we do in the Father, and honour the one as we do the other. Christianity, therefore, not merely as a system of doctrine, but as a practical religion, is founded on this doctrine. The God who is the object of all the exercise of Christian piety, is the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

Such, by common consent, are the scriptural facts on this subject. The summation of these facts, in the form of doctrine, as given by the church, is: "There are three persons in the Godhead: the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one God, the same in substance, and equal in power and glory." This is the sum of the Nicene and Athanasian creeds, the common faith of the Christian world. It is scarcely more than a compendious statement of admitted facts. The word person is only a concise form of expressing the third class of facts above mentioned. It is not intended to explain them. It is intended simply as a denial that the Father, Son, and Spirit are mere modal distinctions, or different revelations of God; and to affirm that those terms indicate such distinctions, as that each is the agent and object of action, and can say I, and be properly addressed as Thou. The church has never taught that there are three consciousnesses, intelligences, and wills, in God. It has humbly refused to press its definition of person beyond the limits just indicated, and has preferred to leave the nature of these distinctions in that obscurity which must ever overhang the infinite God in the view of his finite creatures. As the Bible does most clearly teach the existence of this three-fold personal distinction in the Godhead, the only question is,

whether we will renounce its authority, or believe what it asserts. Dr. Bushnell does not attempt to show that the church doctrine on this subject is unscriptural. His only objection is, that he cannot understand it. He sums up his whole argument on the subject, by saying: "Such is the confusion produced by attempting to assert a real and metaphysical trinity of persons, in the divine nature. Whether the word is taken at its full import, or diminished away to a mere something called a distinction, there is produced only contrariety, confusion, practical negation, not light." p. 135. This is all he has to say. If the word person has its proper sense, then the church doctrine asserts three consciousnesses, intelligences, and wills, in the divine nature. If it means merely a "distinction," then Trinitarians do not differ from Unitarians. The former he asserts is the meaning of the word, and therefore "any intermediate doctrine between the absolute unity of God and a social unity is impossible and incredible." He shuts us up to Tritheism or Unitarianism—no threefold distinction in the divine nature can be admitted. There can be no doubt, therefore, either as to our author's rejection of the doctrine of the Trinity, or as to the purely rationalistic grounds of that rejection.

His own view of the subject is, that the terms Father, Son, and Spirit, refer to a threefold revelation of God. He says, speaking of "Schleiermacher's critique of Sabellius," translated and published in the *Biblical Repository*: "The general view of the Trinity in that article coincides, it will be observed, with the view which I have presented, though the reasonings are not in all points the same." p. 111. With Schleiermacher the absolute God is unknown. It is only the manifested, or revealed God of which we can speak. This revelation is threefold. First, the manifestation of the one God in the world: this is the Father. Second, the manifestation of the one God in Jesus Christ: this is the Son. Third, the revelation of the one God in the church: this is the Spirit. It is hardly necessary to quote particular passages to show how exactly Dr. Bushnell has adopted this system. In language almost Hegelian, he asks, p. 129: What conception shall we form "of God as simply in Himself, and as yet unrevealed? Only that He is the Absolute being, the Infinite, the I am that I am, giving no sign that he is other than that he is." "But there is in God, taken as

the absolute Being, a capacity of self-expression, so to speak, which is peculiar,—a generative power of form, a creative imagination, in which, or by the aid of which, He can produce Himself outwardly, or represent himself in the finite.” p. 145. In creating worlds, “He only represents, expresses, or outwardly produces himself.” This is the first revelation, or, the Father. But, “as God has produced himself in all the other finite forms of being,” so he appears in the human. This is the second revelation, or the Son. pp. 146, 147. “But in order to the full and complete apprehension of God, a third personality, the Holy Spirit, needs to appear. By the Logos in the Creation, and then by the Logos in the incarnation, assisted or set off by the Father as a relative personality, God’s character, feeling and truth, are expressed. . . . But we want, also, to conceive of Him as in *act* within us, working in us under the conditions of time and progression, spiritual results of quickening, deliverance and purification from evil. . . . . Accordingly, the natural image, *Spirit*, that is, breath, is taken up and clothed with personality.” p. 171. This is the third revelation, or, the Holy Spirit. This, true enough, is the Sabellianism of Schleiermacher—a threefold revelation of God in the world, in Christ, and in the church.

This is all very fine. But there is one thing that spoils it all. Dr. Bushnell holds the details of a system without holding its fundamental, formative principle. There is nothing in his book to intimate that he is really a Pantheist. On the contrary, there is every thing against that assumption. Schleiermacher’s whole system, however, rests on the doctrine that there is but one substance in the universe, which substance is God; and especially that the divine and human natures are identical. It is well enough, therefore, for him to talk of God’s producing himself in the world; for according to his theory, in a very high sense, the world is God. It is well enough for him to say that, though Christ is God, he had but one nature, because, with him the human nature is divine, and a perfect man is God. What, therefore, in Schleiermacher is consistent and imposing, is in Dr. Bushnell simply absurd. The system of the one is a Doric temple, and that of the other a heap of stones.

We will not insult our readers with any argument to show that the Bible does not teach Sabellianism. If any one needs



such proof, we refer him to those parts of this book in which Dr. Bushnell attempts to prove that the one divine person, incarnate in Christ, sent himself, obeyed himself, and worshipped himself. The perusal will doubtless excite the reader's pity, but it will effectually convince him he must renounce faith in the scriptures before he can be a Sabellian. There is another thing to be observed. Schleiermacher stands outside of the Bible. He professes to it no manner of allegiance as a rule of faith. He takes out of it what he likes, and combining it with his Pantheistical principles, constructs a massive system of Theosophical philosophy, which does not pretend to rest on the authority of an objective revelation. It is enough, therefore, to move one to wonder, or to indignation, to see that system, which its author puts forth as human, presented by professed believers in the Bible as scriptural and divine. Dr. Bushnell has chosen to enrol himself among the avowed opposers of the church doctrine of the Trinity. He fully endorses as conclusive the common Unitarian objections to that doctrine, and then presents one for which its author claims no divine authority, and which stands in undisguised opposition to the word of God. He must stretch his license as a poet a great way, if he can claim to be a Trinitarian, simply because he recognises a threefold revelation of God. If this be enough to constitute a Trinitarian, the title may be claimed by all the Pantheists of ancient and modern times. They all have a thesis, antithesis, and synthesis, of some sort. They all teach that the absolute Being, (which they represent very much as Dr. Bushnell does, as nihil,) of which nothing can be affirmed and nothing denied, is ever coming to self-consciousness in the world, and returning into himself. Dr. B. affirms with them an eternal creation, (p. 146,) and gives us, for the living and ever-blessed Trinity, nothing but a lifeless God, a world, and humanity. This at least is substantially the system which he professes to adopt, and of which his book, in one aspect, is a feeble and distorted image. We say in one aspect, because it is only in one aspect. It is characteristic of these Discourses, as we remarked at the outset, that their elements are incongruous. They teach every thing, and of course nothing. Pantheism is only one of the phases in which the manifold system of the author is presented. The book is really theistical after all.

In rejecting the scriptural doctrine of the Trinity, our author of course discards the common doctrine of the Incarnation. That doctrine is arrived at precisely as the doctrine of the Trinity was framed. It is but a comprehensive statement of the facts asserted in the scriptures concerning the Lord Jesus. The most essential of those facts are: 1. That all the titles, attributes and perfections of God are ascribed to him, and that we are required to render to him all those duties of love, confidence, reverence and obedience, which are due to God alone. 2. That all the distinctive appellations, attributes, and acts, of a man, are ascribed to him. He is called the man Christ Jesus, and the Son of Man. He is said to have been born of a woman, to have hungered and thirsted, to have bled and died. He increased in wisdom, was ignorant of the day of judgment; he manifested all innocent human affections, and, in dying, committed his soul unto God. 3. He of whom all divine perfections, and all the attributes of our nature, are freely and constantly predicated, when speaking of himself, always says, I, Me, Mine. He is always addressed as Thou; he is always spoken of as He or Him. There is no where the slightest intimation or manifestation of a twofold personality in Christ. There is not a "divine soul" with a human soul inhabiting the same body—i. e. he was not two persons. There is but one subsistence, suppositum, or person. 4. This one person is often called a man when even divine acts or perfections are attributed to him. It is the Son of Man who is to awake the dead, to summon all nations, and to sit in judgment on all men. It is the Son of Man who was in heaven before his advent, and who, while on earth, was still in heaven. On the other hand, he is often called God when the things predicated of him are human. The Lord of Glory was crucified. He who was in the beginning with God, who was the true God and eternal life, was seen and handled. Again, the subject does not change though the predicates do. Thus in the first chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, it is said of the Son: 1. That he is the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of his substance. 2. That he upholds all things by the word of his power. 3. That by (the offering of) himself he made purification of sin. 4. That he is set down at the right hand of the majesty on high. Here the possession of a divine nature, the exercise of almighty power, dying as an

offering for sin, and exaltation to the right hand of God, are all predicated of one and the same subject. In like manner, in the second chapter of the Phillippians, it is said, He who was in the form of God, and entitled to equality with God, was found in fashion as man, humbled himself so as to become obedient unto death, and is exalted above all creatures in heaven and earth. Here equality with God, humanity, humiliation, and exaltation, are predicated of the same subject. Such representations are not peculiar to the New Testament. In all the Messianic predictions, he who is declared to be the mighty God and everlasting Father, is said to be born, and to have a government assigned him. On one page he is called Jehovah, whose glory fills the earth, and on the next a man of sorrow and acquainted with grief.

In framing a comprehensive statement of these facts, it will not do to say, that Christ was a mere man, for this is inconsistent with the divine perfections and honour ascribed to him. It will not do to say that he is simply God, for that is inconsistent with his manifest humanity. It will not do to say that he is God and a man as two distinct subsistences, for he stands forth in the evangelical history as manifestly one person, as does Peter or John. The only thing that can be said is, that "The eternal Son of God became man by taking to himself a true body and a reasonable soul, and so was and continues to be, God and man, in two distinct natures, and one person forever." This is the substance of the Nicene and Athanasian creeds so far as they relate to the person of Christ. It will be observed how little this statement includes beyond the undeniable facts of the case. It asserts that there is in Christ a divine nature, because divine perfections, authority, and works, of necessity suppose such a nature. It asserts that he has a human nature, because he is not only called a man, but all the attributes of our nature are ascribed to him. And it asserts that he is one person because he always so speaks of himself, and is so spoken of by the sacred writers. The church doctrine, therefore, on this subject, is clearly the doctrine of the Bible.

Before advertng for a moment to the objections which Dr. Bushnell urges to this view of the person of Christ, we remark on the unreasonableness of the demand, which he makes, when attacking the church doctrine, that all obscurity should be ban-

ished from this subject. The union between the soul and body, with all the advantage of its lying within the domain of consciousness and the sphere of constant observation, is an impenetrable mystery. Dr. Bushnell can understand it as little as he can understand the relation between the divine and human natures of Christ. It is therefore glaringly unreasonable, and rebellious against God, to reject what He has revealed on this subject because it is a mystery, and preëminently the great mystery of the gospel.

Our author objects that the doctrine of two natures in Christ "does an affront to the plain language of the scripture. For the scripture does not say that a certain human soul called Jesus born as such of Mary, obeyed and suffered, but it says in the boldest manner, that he who was in the form of God humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. A declaration the very point of which is, not that the man Jesus was a being under human limitations, but that he who was in the form of God, the real divinity, came into the finite, and was subject to human conditions." p. 153. In answer to this objection we would remark, 1. That it is one of the plainest rules of interpretation that when any thing is predicated of a subject inconsistent with its known and admitted nature, such predicate cannot be referred directly to the subject. It must either be understood figuratively, or in reference, not to the subject itself, but to something intimately connected with it. If it is said of a man that he roars, or that he flies, or that he is shabby, these things are necessarily understood in a way consistent with the known and admitted nature of man. If it is said he is blind, or deaf, or lame, of necessity, again, this is understood of his body and not of his spirit. In like manner when it is said of God, that he sees, hears, has hands, eyes, or ears, or that he is angry, or that he is aggrieved, or that he enquires and searches out, all these declarations are universally understood in consistency with the known and admitted nature of the Supreme Being. By a like necessity, and with as little violence to any correct rule of interpretation, when any thing is affirmed of Christ that implies limitation, whether ignorance, obedience, or suffering, it must be understood, not of "the real divinity," but of his limited nature. It is only, therefore, by violating a



principle of interpretation universally recognised and admitted, that the objection under consideration can be sustained. 2. It was shown to be a constant usage of scripture to predicate of Christ, whatever can be predicated of either of the natures united in his person. Of man may be affirmed any thing that is true either of his soul or his body. He may be said to be mortal or immortal; to be a spirit created in the image of God, and to be a child of the dust. And still further, he is often designated as a spirit, when what is affirmed of him is true only of his animal nature. We speak of rational and immortal beings as given up to gluttony and drunkenness, without meaning to affirm that the immortal soul can eat and drink. Why then, when it is said of the blessed Saviour, that he suffered and obeyed, must it be understood of the "real divinity?" If Dr. Bushnell means to be consistent, he must not only assert that the deity suffers, but that God can be pierced with nails and spear. It was the Lord of Glory who was crucified. They shall look on me whom they have pierced, said the eternal Jehovah. Does our author mean to affirm that it was the "real divinity" that was nailed to the cross, and thrust through with a spear?

3. The principle of interpretation on which the objection is founded, would prove that human nature is infinite and eternal. If because the scriptures say that he who was in the form of God became obedient unto death, it follows that the "real divinity" died; then the assertion that the Son of Man, was in heaven before his advent, and in heaven while on earth, proves that human nature has the attributes of eternity and omnipresence. The Bible tells us that the Son of God assumed our nature, or took part of flesh and blood, in order that he might be a merciful and faithful high-priest, able to sympathize in the infirmities of his people; but whence the necessity of his assuming flesh and blood, if the divine nature can suffer and obey? It is really to deny God to affirm of him, what is absolutely incompatible with his divine perfections. It is a virtual denial of God, therefore, to affirm that the "real divinity," is ignorant, obeys, and dies. Let the Bible be interpreted on the same principle on which the language of common life is understood, and there will be no more difficulty in comprehending the declaration that the Lord of Glory was crucified, than the

assertion concerning man, Dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return. Is the "Thou" in man, the interior person, dust? Dr. Bushnell must say, yes, and the affirmation would be as rational as his assertion that the divinity in Christ, became subject to the "human conditions" of ignorance and sorrow.

Another objection is thus presented. The common doctrine "virtually denies any real unity between the human and the divine, and substitutes collocation or copartnership for unity." "The whole work of Christ, as a subject, suffering Redeemer, is thrown upon the human side of his nature, and the divine side standing thus aloof incommunicably distant, has nothing in fact to do with the transaction, other than to be a spectator." p. 155. There would be as much truth and reason in the assertion, that the spiritual, the rational and immortal part of a dying martyr, was a mere spectator of the sufferings of his body. It is the martyr who suffers, though the immaterial spirit cannot be burnt or lacerated. With equal truth, it is the Lord of Glory who died upon the cross, and the Son of God who poured out his soul unto death, though we hold it blasphemy to say it was the divine nature as such, the "real divinity" in Christ, that was subject to the limitations and sorrows of humanity. Dr. Bushnell says a hypostatical union, i. e. such an union between the human and divine as to constitute one person, is mere collation. Is the union of soul and body in one person, mere collation? If it is a man who suffers when his body is injured; no less truly was it the Son of God who suffered, when his sacred body was lacerated by the scourge, or pierced with nails. The acts of Christ, for the sake of clearness, are referred to three classes. The purely divine, such as the creation of the world; the purely human, such as walking or sleeping; the theanthropical, such as his whole work as mediator, all he did and suffered for the redemption of the world. It was not the obedience or death of a man, by which our redemption was affected; but the obedience and sufferings of the Son of God. Christ, be it remembered, is not a human person invested with certain divine perfections and prerogatives. Nor was he a human person with whom a divine person dwelt in a manner analogous to God's presence in his prophets or his people; or to the indwelling of demons in the case of the possessed. He was a divine person with a human nature, and

therefore every thing true of that nature may be predicated of that divine person, just as freely as every thing true of our material bodies may be predicated of us, whose real personality is an immaterial spirit. In some feeble analogy to the three classes of the acts of Christ, above referred to, is a similar classification of human actions. Some are purely bodily, as the pulsations of the heart; others are purely mental, as thought; others are mixed, as sensation, or voluntary muscular action, or the emotions of shame, fear, &c. It is absurd to confound all these, and to assert that the spirit has a pulse. It is no less absurd so to separate them, as to say any one of these kinds of actions is not the activity of the man. In asserting then a personal union, between the two natures in Christ, the church asserts a real union, not confounding but uniting them, so that the acts of the human nature of Christ, are as truly the acts of the Son of God, as the acts of our bodies are our acts. All those objections therefore founded on the assumption that the common doctrine provides no explanation of the mediatorial work, representing it after all, as the work of a mere man, are destitute of foundation. It was because the divine nature, as such could neither suffer nor obey, that the Son of God assumed a nature capable of such obedience and suffering, but the assumption of that nature into personal union with himself made the nature His, and therefore the obedience and sufferings were also His. It is right to say, God purchased the church with his own blood.

A third objection is that while separate activity is made a proof of the distinct personality of the Son and Spirit, it is not allowed to be a proof of the distinct personality of the human nature of Christ. What in the Godhead is affirmed to be evidence of a distinction of persons, is denied to be sufficient evidence of such distinction in the reference to the two natures in Christ. Or, to state the case still more strongly, we ascribe separate intelligence and will to the human nature of Christ, and deny it to be a person; though we dare not say there are three intelligences and wills in God, and still insist there are three persons in the Godhead.

The simple and sufficient answer to this objection is that in the Bible, the Father, Son, and Spirit are distinguished as separate persons, and the two natures in Christ are not so distin-

guished. This is reason enough to justify the church, in refusing to consider even separate intelligence and will, in the one case, proof of distinct personality; while, in the other, identity of intelligence and will is affirmed to be consistent with diversity of person. The fact is plain that the Father, Son and Spirit are distinguished as persons; the one sends and another is sent; the one promises the other engages, the one says I, the other Thou. It is not less plain, that the two natures of Christ are not thus distinguished. The one nature does not address the other; the one does not send the other; neither does the one ever say I and Thou in reference to the other. There is not only the absence of all evidence of distinct personality, but there is also the direct, manifold, and uniform assertion of unity of person. There is nothing about Christ more perfectly undeniable than this, and therefore, there never has been even a heresy in the church, (the doubtful case of the Nestorians excepted) ascribing a two-fold personality to the Redeemer. It is one and the same person of whom birth, life, death, eternity, omniscience, omnipotence, and all other attributes, human and divine, are predicated. So far, therefore, as the scriptures are concerned, there is the greatest possible difference between the relation in which the distinctions in the Trinity stand to each other, and the mutual relation of the two natures in Christ. In the one case, the distinction is personal, in the other, it is not. If there is any contradiction here it is chargeable on the Bible itself.

But it may still be said that we must frame a definition of person which shall not involve the affirmation and denial of the same proposition. We cannot say separate intelligent agency constitutes or evinces personality, and then ascribe such agency to the human nature of Christ, while we deny it to be a person. Very true. We do not deny that theologians often fail in their definitions, we should be satisfied with saying, that the distinctions in the God-head are such as to lay an adequate foundation for the reciprocal use of the pronouns, I, Thou, He; and that the distinction between the two natures in Christ does not. If asked where lies the difference since in both cases, there is separate activity? We answer, no one can tell. We may say indeed, that distinct subsistence is essential to personality, and



that such subsistence cannot be predicated of the human nature of Christ, but is predicable of the distinctions in the God-head. It is not, therefore, all kinds of separate activity which implies personality, but only such as involves distinct subsistence, showing that the source of the activity is an agent, and not merely a power.\*

The following illustration of this subject, is not designed to explain it, a mystery is not capable of explanation. It is designed merely to show how much of the same obscurity overhangs other subjects about which we give ourselves very little trouble. We may, for the sake of illustration, assume the truth of the Platonic doctrine which ascribes to man, a body, an animal soul, and an immortal spirit. This is not a scriptural distinction, though it is not obviously absurd, and, if a matter of revelation, would be cheerfully admitted. What however is involved in this doctrine? There is an unity of person in man and yet, three distinct activities; that of the body in the processes of respiration and digestion; that of the animal soul, in all mere sensations and instincts; and that of the spirit, in all intellectual and moral action. The animal soul is not a person, it has no distinct subsistence, though it may have its activity and even its own consciousness, as in the case of brutes. Now if there is no contradiction involved in this view of the nature of man; if the animal soul may have its activity and life in personal union with the intelligent spirit, and yet that soul not be a person, then the human nature of Christ may have its activity, in personal union with the Logos, and yet not be a person. We place little stress, however, on any such illustrations. Our faith rests on the plain declarations of scripture. God is infinite, omniscient, and almighty, and therefore of him no limitation can be predicated, whether ignorance or weakness; of Christ is predicated all the perfections of God and all the attributes of man and therefore there is in him, both a divine and human nature; and notwithstanding the possession of this two-fold nature, he is but one person. It is not necessary to our faith, that we should understand

\* Dr. Bushnell has no great right to make a wry face at Trinitarians for asserting that separate intelligence and will does not necessarily infer personality. since he has begun to swallow a philosophy which asserts the single personality of the human race, though each man has his own intelligence, will and consciousness.

this. We can understand it, just as well as we understand the mysteries of our own nature, or the attributes of God. After all, the difficulty is not in the doctrines of the Trinity or the Incarnation, but in Theism, the most certain and essential, and yet the most incomprehensible of all truths.

But if we insist on acknowledging only one nature in Christ, how are we to conceive of his person? The following would seem to be the only possible modes in which he can be regarded: 1. That his one nature is human, and that he was a mere man. 2. That his one nature was divine; then it may be assumed, with the Docetæ, that his human appearance is but a phantasm; or, with the Apollinarians, that he had a real body, but not a rational soul. 3. That his one nature was neither divine nor human, but theanthropical, the two united into one, according to the Eutychean notion. 4. That the human and divine are identical, which is the doctrine of the new philosophy. Every one of these views, incompatible as they obviously are, Dr. Bushnell adopts by turns, except the first.

He adopts, or at least dallies with, the doctrine of the Docetæ, that the whole manifestation of Christ was a mere Theophany. To assert the union of two natures in the Redeemer, or to attempt any precise statement of the constitution of his person, he says, is as though Abraham, "after he had entertained as a guest the Jehovah Angel, or Angel of the Lord, instead of receiving his message, had fallen to inquiring into the digestive process of the Angel;" or, "as if Moses, when he saw the burning bush, had fallen to speculating about the fire." Thus those who "live in their logic," exclaim: "See Christ obeys and suffers; how can the subject be supreme—the suffering man the impassible God!" And then, in one of those exquisite illustrations, which, as our Saviour says of another kind of lying wonders, would, if it were possible, deceive the very elect, he adds: "Indeed you may figure this whole tribe of sophisters as a man standing before that most beautiful and wondrous work of art, the 'Beatified Spirit' of Guido, and there commencing a quarrel with the artist, that he should be so absurd as to think of making a beatified spirit out of mere linseed, ochres and oxides! Would it not be more dignified to let the pigments go, and take the expression of the canvass? Just so (!) are the human personality, the obedient, subject, suffering state of

Jesus, all to be taken as colours of the Divine, and we are not to fool ourselves in practising our logic on the colours, but to seize at once upon the divine import and significance thereof; ascending thus to the heart of God, there to rest, in the vision of his beatific glory." p. 160. The meaning of this is, that as the value and power of a picture is in "the expression of the canvass," so the power of Christ is in "what he expresses." In order to this expression, however, there is no need of a true body and a reasonable soul; a theophany, as in the case of the Jehovah Angel, is all that is necessary. We accept this illustration as to one point. There is all the difference between the Christ of the Bible and the Christ of Dr. Bushnell, that there is between an *Ecce Homo* and the living incarnate God.

In a few pages further on, the author rejects this view of the subject, and says: "Christ is no such theophany, no such casual, unhistorical being as the Jehovah Angel who visited Abraham." p. 165. So unsteady, however, is his tread, that in a few more steps he falls again into the same mode of representation. On p. 172, he says: "*Just as* the Logos is incarnated in the flesh, so the Spirit makes his advent under physical signs, appropriate to his office, coming in a rushing mighty wind, tipping the heads of an assembly with lambent flames, &c. &c." The Logos, therefore, was no more really incarnate than the Spirit was incorporate in the dove, the wind, or the tongues of fire—all is appearance, expression.

But if Dr. Bushnell teaches the doctrine of the Docetæ, he still more distinctly avows that of the Apollinarians. The main point in their theory on this subject is, that Christ had a human body, but not a human soul; the Logos in him taking the place of the intelligent Spirit. The nature of our author's view of the constitution of Christ's person, is best learned from the answers which he gives to the objections, which he sees will be made against it. The first objection is, that "the infinite God is represented as dwelling in a finite human person, subject to its limitations and even to its evils; and this is incredible—an insult to reason." p. 148. His answer is, "It no more follows that a human body measures God, when revealed through it, than that a star, a tree, or an insect, measures Him, when he is revealed through that." p. 152. A second objection is, Christ grew in wisdom and knowledge. This he answers

by saying: 1. "That the language may well enough be taken as language of external description merely." Or, 2. "If the divine was manifested in the ways of a child, it creates no difficulty which does not exist when it is manifested in the ways of a man or a world." It is as repugnant, he says, to Christ's proper Deity, to reason and think, as to say he learns or grows in knowledge. p. 153. A third objection is, that Christ obeys, worships, and suffers. He says, the Trinitarian answer to this objection—viz. that these things are to be understood of the human soul of Christ, is an affront to the scriptures, which assert that "the real divinity came into the finite and was subject to human conditions." p. 154. When we see the Absolute Being "under the conditions of increase, obedience, worship, suffering, we have nothing to do but to ask what is here expressed, and, as long as we do that, we shall have no difficulty." p. 156. All is a mockery and show—even the agony in the garden, the calling on God in Gethsemane and on the cross, was, we tremble as we write, a pantomime, in which the infinite God was the actor. To such depths does a man sink when, inflated with self-conceit, he pretends to be wise above that which is written. "Of what so great consequence to us," he asks, "are the humanities of a mere human soul? The very thing we want is to find God is moved by such humanities—touched with a feeling of our infirmities." p. 165.

These passages teach distinctly the Apollinarian doctrine. They deny that there are two distinct natures in Christ; and they affirm that ignorance, weakness, obedience, worshipping and suffering, are to be predicated of the Logos, the Deity, the divine nature as such. Thus far the doctrine taught in this book is little more than the re-introduction, with great pomp and circumstance, of an effete and half-forgotten heresy. It is the bringing back a dead Napoleon to the Invalides.

Dr. Bushnell next teaches the Eutychean doctrine. Eutyches taught that the divine and human were so united in Christ as to become one nature as well as one person. He thought, as Dr. Bushnell does, that two natures imply two persons. (ὁ ὅμοιος λαγών φύσεις δύο λαγεῖ υἱούς.) Before the union there were two natures; after it, only one. He acknowledged, therefore, in Christ, but one life, intelligence, and will. This, after all, appears to be the doctrine which Dr. Bushnell is really aiming at.



We have Eutycheanism distinctly asserted for example, on p. 154. The common doctrine, he says, "virtually denies any real unity between the human and divine, and substitutes collocation, co-partnership for unity." "Instead of a person whose nature is the unity of the divine and the human, we have," he adds, "two distinct persons, between whom our thoughts are constantly alternating; referring this to one, and that to the other, and imagining, all the while, not a union of the two, in which our possible union with God is signified and sealed forever, but a practical, historical assertion of his incommunicability thrust upon our notice." In these, among other passages, we have the doctrine, not that the divine nature or Logos, was in the place of the human soul, but that the divine and human natures were so united as to make one, neither human nor divine, but, as our author calls it, "the divine human."

All these forms of doctrine respecting the person of Christ, sprang up in the church. They all suppose the doctrine of a personal God distinct from the world. They take for granted a real creation in time. They assume a distinction between God and man, as two different natures, and between matter and mind as two substances. In man, therefore, there are two substances or subjects, spirit and body, united in one person. It was at a later period the heathen doctrine found its way into the church, that there is but one substance, intelligence, and life in the universe, (*ἐν μόνον τὸ ὄν εἶναι*); a doctrine which identifies God and the world; which denies any extra-mundane deity, any proper creation, any real distinction between God and man. This is the Atheistic doctrine which has been revived in our day, and which has been, and still is, taught by deceivers and the deceived, in the church, as the doctrine of the Bible, or at least as consistent with it. The new philosophy teaches, as before stated, that the absolute God is nothing; He exists only as he is revealed. He produces himself in the world; or, in the world he becomes objective to himself, and thus self-conscious. The human race is the highest form of the world, and, consequently the highest development of God. Men are God as self-conscious. What the Bible says of the Son as being God, one with the Father, his image, &c., is to be understood of the race. God is but the substance or power of which all phenomena are

the manifestations. All life is God's life, all action is his acting; there is no liberty, no sin, no immortality. The race is immortal, but not the individuals; they succeed each other as the waves of the sea, or the leaves of the forest. This is the worst form of Atheism; for it not only denies God, but deifies man, and destroys all morality in its very principle.

Schleiermacher, in his later writings, does not go all these lengths. His system however is founded on the real identity of God and the world, the human and divine.\* It makes creation eternal and necessary. It destroys entirely human liberty and responsibility. It admits nothing as sin except to the consciousness and apprehension of the sinner. And the personal immortality of the soul it repudiates; i. e. his system leads to its rejection; but out of deference to Christ it is admitted as a fact. With him the divine Being, as such, is the one hidden God; the Trinity is the manifested God; the Father is God as manifested in the world; the Son, God as manifested in Christ; and the Spirit, God as manifested in the church. With this view of the Trinity a corresponding view of the person of Christ is necessarily connected. The world is one manifestation of God, God in one form; the human race a higher manifestation of God; which manifestation, imperfect in Adam and his posterity, is perfected in Christ; the creation begun in the former is completed in the latter. Christ is the ideal man, and, as God and man are one, Christ is God. There are not two natures in Christ but one only, a divine nature which is truly human. As men are partakers of the imperfect nature of Adam, they are redeemed by partaking of the perfect nature of Christ, and thus the incarnation of God is continued in the church. Hence follows subjective justification, and rejection of the doctrines of the atonement and regeneration by the Holy Spirit, as matters of course.†

As Dr. Bushnell adopts Schleiermacher's view of the Trinity,

\* DORNER, the disciple of Schleiermacher, gives as his reason for associating him with Schelling and Hegel, that "he undoubtedly proceeds on the assumption of the essential unity of God and man, though he did not hold that substantial Pantheism in which subjectivity is a mere accident." See his *Christologie*, p. 487. Schleiermacher was educated a Moravian. His philosophy was pantheistical; with his philosophy his early religious convictions kept up a continual struggle, and, as it is hoped, ultimately gained the victory. This, however, does not alter the nature of his system.

† Schleiermacher's *Glaubenslehre* §§. 299-328. Dorner's *Christologie* (Stuttgart, 1839.) pp. 487-529.

he naturally adopts his doctrine as to the person of Christ. In Christ there is but one nature; that nature is divine, "the real divinity;" it is also truly human, God in human flesh is a perfect man. He becomes incorporated in the history of our race, and thus redemption is effected. All this we have on page 149 and elsewhere. "If God," says our author, "were to inhabit such a vehicle [i. e. a human person,] one so fellow to ourselves and live Himself as a perfect character into the biographic history of the world, a result would follow of as great magnificence as the creation of the world itself, viz: the incorporation of the Divine in the history of the world—so a renovation, at last, of the moral and religious life of the world. If now the human person will express more of God than the whole created universe besides—and it certainly will more of God's feeling and character—and if a motive possessing as great consequence as the creation of the world invites Him to do it, is it more extravagant to believe that the Word will become flesh, than that the Word has become, or produced in time, a material universe." According to this passage: The Word or God became a material universe; (i. e. became objective to himself in the world, we suppose.) In the same sense he became flesh, and was a "perfect character," or a perfect man. As such he became biographically, historically, or organically, (all these expressions are used,) connected with our race. The Divine was thus incorporated in the history of the world; or in other words, the incarnation of God is continued in the church. This incorporation, or incarnation, is the source of the renovation of the moral and religious life of the world. All this agrees with Schleiermacher to a tittle.

In accordance with this same theory are such expressions as the following, which are of frequent occurrence through the work. "The highest glory of the incarnation, viz: the union signified and historically begun, between God and man." p. 156. Christ is "an integral part, in one view, of the world's history, only bringing into it, and setting into organic union with it, the Eternal Life." "God manifested in the flesh—historically united with our race." p. 165; and all the other cant phrases of the day, which are designed and adapted to ensnare silly women, male and female.

We think we have made out our case. Dr. Bushnell's

book in our poor judgment, is a failure. It pulls down, but does not erect. He attacks and argues against the doctrines of the Trinity, Incarnation, and Atonement, and after all acknowledges not only that they are taught in scripture, but that we are forced by the constitution or necessities of our nature, to conceive of them in their scriptural form. He mixes up in his volume the most incongruous materials. He is rationalist, mystic, pantheist, Christian, by turns, just as the emergency demands. He is extravagant to the extreme of paradox. He adopts, on all the subjects he discusses, the long exploded heresies of former centuries, and endeavours to cover them all with the gaudy mantle of the new philosophy. His mysticism spoils his rationalism, and his philosophy spoils his mysticism, and is then, in its turn spoiled by having its essential element left out. Instead of a real Trinity he gives us a three-fold appearance. Instead of Emmanuel, God manifest in the flesh, he gives us a Christ which is either a mere expression thrown on the dark canvass of history; or a being who is neither God nor man. Instead of a true propitiation, he bids us behold a splendid work of art! These are the doctrines which, he says, "live in their own majesty," and for which he predicts a triumph which finds its appropriate prefiguration in nothing short of the resurrection of the Son of God! p. 116. For the honour of our race we hope that such a book as this is not about to turn the world upside down.

We have reserved to the close of our review a remark, which was the first to occur to us on a perusal of these Discourses. Dr. Bushnell forgets that there are certain doctrines so settled by the faith of the church, that they are no longer open questions. They are finally adjudged and determined. If men set aside the Bible, and choose to speak or write as philosophers, then of course the way is open for them, to teach what they please. But for Christians, who acknowledge the scriptures as their rule of faith, there are doctrines which they are bound to take as settled beyond all rational or innocent dispute. This may be regarded as a popish sentiment; as a denial of the right of private judgment, or an assertion of the infallibility of the church. It is very far from being either. Does, however, the objector think that the errors of Romanism rest on the thin air, or are mere grotesque forms of unsubstantial vapour?



If this were so, they could have neither permanence nor import. They are all sustained by an inward truth, which gives them life and power, despite of their deformities. It is as though a perfect statue had been left under the calcareous drippings of a cavern, until deformed by incrustations; or, as if some exquisite work of art, in church or convent, had been so daubed over by the annual whitewasher, or covered by the dust of centuries, as to escape recognition; but which, when the superincumbent filth is removed, appears in all its truth and beauty. The truth which underlies and sustains the Romish doctrine as to the authority of the church in matters of faith, is this: The Holy Spirit dwells in the people of God, and leads them to the saving knowledge of divine things; so that those who depart from the faith of God's people, depart from the teachings of the Spirit, and from the source of life. The Romish distortion of this truth is, that the Holy Ghost dwells in the Pope, as the ultramontanists say; or in the bishops, as the Gallican theologians say, and guides him or them into the infallible knowledge of all matters pertaining to faith and practice. They err both as to the subjects and object of this divine guidance. They make the rulers of the external church to be its recipients, and its object to render them infallible as judges and teachers. Its true subjects are all the sincere people of God, and its object is to make them wise unto salvation. The promise of divine teaching no more secures infallibility than the promise of holiness secures perfection in this life. There is, however, such a divine teaching, and its effect is to bring the children of God, in all parts of the world, and in all ages of the church, to unity of faith. As an historical fact, they have always and every where agreed in all points of necessary doctrine. And therefore to depart from their faith, in such matters of agreement, is to renounce the gospel. In some cases it may be difficult to determine what the true people of God have in all ages believed. This is an historical fact, which evinces itself more or less distinctly, as all other facts of history do. In many cases, however, there is and can be no reasonable doubt about the matter; and the doctrines which Dr. Bushnell discusses and discards, viz. the Trinity, Incarnation, and Atonement, are precisely those in which their agreement is most certain and complete. It is high time, therefore, it should be universally agreed among Chris-

tians, that the rejection of these doctrines, as determined by the faith of the church, is the rejection of Christianity, and should be so regarded and treated. Let sceptics and philosophers teach what they please, or what they dare, but it is surely time to have some certain ground in Christianity, and to put the brand of universal reprobation on the hypocritical and wicked device of preaching infidelity in a cassock.

Dr. Bushnell is like a man who, wearied with the obscurity or monotony of a crowded ship, jumps overboard, determined to scull single-handed his little boat across the ocean. Or, he is like a man who should leave the ark to ride out the deluge on a slimy log. Such madness excites nothing but commiseration. It is evident Dr. Bushnell does not fully understand himself. He is lost, and therefore often crosses his own path; and it is to be hoped that much of the error contained in his book has not got real or permanent possession of his mind. He is a poet, and neither a philosopher nor theologian; a bright star, which has wandered from its orbit, and which must continue to wander, unless it return and obey the attraction of the great central orb—God's everlasting word.

---

## QUARTERLY LIST OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

Phrenology Examined, and shown to be inconsistent with the Principles of Physiology, Mental and Moral Science, and the Doctrines of Christianity. Also an Examination of the Claims of Mesmerism. By N. L. Rice, D. D., Pastor of the Central Presbyterian Church, Cincinnati. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 285 Broadway. Cincinnati: John D. Thorpe, 12 West Fourth st. 1849. 12mo. pp. 318.

This work comprises two distinct arguments: one directed against Phrenology, and the other against Mesmerism. We have so long looked upon Phrenology as exploded and effete, and upon Mesmerism as a miserable abortion of folly, in the judgment of ninety-nine out of a hundred considerate and reflecting men, that we were somewhat surprised to find Dr. Rice turning aside to construct so full and elaborate an argument on either of these subjects. Like every thing we have even seen from the pen of its author,

it is clear and thorough as an argument, and masterly and conclusive as a refutation. Indeed, the first impression produced by its perusal, was that of the immense disproportion between the massiveness and solidity of the argument, and the paltriness of the thing to be refuted. It reminded us of getting up a steam engine to crack a nut, whose kernel, when cracked, proved to be withered and worthless.

In order to make out its hypothesis, phrenology presents us with a new physiology of the brain, and also with a new psychology adapted thereto. In order to the first, it enters into conflict with the received anatomy of the encephalon; and in accomplishing the latter, it is obliged to subvert all the old doctrines of mental and moral philosophy. To do all this is no trifling undertaking: but all this, phrenology, without the least apparent sense of presumption, undertakes to do. When a set of men are capable of rejecting theories which have grown up under the accumulated observation of all preceding generations, and satisfied the judgment of all the world besides themselves, for the sake of establishing some new and radical hypothesis resting upon a foundation of the narrowest empiricism, they are capable of any thing. We need no longer wonder to find them affirming that the brain contains thirty or forty organs, not only distinct in their functions, but expressing themselves on the outside of the cranium by their proportionate internal development, while no such organs can be found by any dissection, and while the obvious structure of the brain, both in its normal and pathological states, renders it perfectly certain that no such organs can exist. It would not be a whit more absurd to pretend that the stomach is a congeries of separate organs, appropriated respectively to the digestion of different articles of food; one organ for digesting beef, another mutton, a third pork, &c., than to attempt to thrust upon the credulity of the public a hypothesis affirming that the convoluted cortical layer of the brain—which is anatomically as much a single continuous tissue in each principal lobe, as the mucous coat of the stomach—has particular spots or patches appropriated to secreting thoughts, feelings and affections of a particular kind. For according to the phrenologists, thought and emotion are as much organic secretions as the gastric juice or the bile.

And then the classification of these functions, considering the seriousness with which they are proposed as a new and improved psychology, is highly amusing. For example, the instinct which prompts an old house-cat to remain in its quarters irrespective of all changes of ownership, is phrenologically the same cerebral function, which enabled Sir Isaac Newton to keep his mind intently fixed upon the problem of the universe, till he had solved it. Both are assigned to the organ of concentrativeness. The organ of veneration, according to its development, prompts one man to worship God, and another to collect old coins.

But it is no part of our object to argue the subject. Those who wish to see it thoroughly done, can be gratified by procuring the work of Dr. Rice. The anatomical argument is enriched by an excellent paper from the pen of Prof. Harrison, of the Medical College of Ohio; as well as by repeated citations from the most eminent members of the medical profession.

In regard to Mesmerism, the thing is so absurd and incredible, that it cannot be true. The facts for which it undertakes to claim our credence, are so extraordinary, that we should utterly refuse our assent to their truth, on any evidence short of that demanded to establish the truth of a miracle, and no evidence could convince us of the truth of a miracle, if it involved the belief of an absurdity. It is so directly in the face of all that we know, that we should sooner suppose ourselves the victims of any sort of delusion, human or superhuman, than admit the possibility of its truth. It not only transcends, but contradicts the most positive and certain knowledge we are capable of possessing. We should therefore unhesitatingly refuse our assent to the testimony adduced to support its extraordinary pretensions, even if we could not see the flaw in that testimony.

But so far from the testimony being of this plausible kind, we venture to say that it is among the most gross and bungling attempts at delusion ever palmed upon the credulity of men. It has been sifted and exploded times without number, from its first appearance in Paris, under the auspices of Mesmer himself, when our countryman, Franklin, was an active member of the commission appointed by the French King to try its claims, to its last exposure in Cincinnati, by a committee of investigation, of which Dr. Drake was the Chairman. In the matter of clairvoyance, it is sheer delusion and imposture, except in the morbid cases of somnambulism, which present no facts more difficult of apprehension than those of ordinary sleep-walkers or talkers. The somnolent state, into which it is unquestionably possible to throw persons of a certain nervous temperament, although presenting some highly curious physiological facts, is clearly due to impressions which may be referred to the power of the imagination, and not to any imaginary but impossible magnetic influence. There is not a single authentic fact in the whole history of Mesmerism more extraordinary than can be found in abundance in the records of pathological medicine; not one more extraordinary than some of the incidents which occurred in the application to the cure of disease, of an instrument which some of our readers may well recollect, the metallic tractors of Perkins. That many of the feats performed by Mesmeric operators, in public assemblies, appear extraordinary, and even conclusive, to intelligent observers among the audience, is neither incredible nor strange. But if any one is tempted thereby to forsake all his old landmarks of belief merely because he cannot detect the imposition, it might be well to try his skill upon the professed jugglery of Signor Blitz or the Fakir of Ava.

**A Brief Review of Thirty Years in the Ministry.** By Joel Hawes, D. D., Pastor of the First Church, Hartford.

This "review" is contained in two sermons, delivered by Dr. Hawes to his people, on the thirtieth anniversary of his settlement among them. The text selected for an occasion so deeply interesting to both pastor and flock, was—"We also believe, and therefore speak." These words naturally led the preacher to state the principal doctrines he had taught during so long a ministry, and the results which he had witnessed.



We always had a favourable opinion of Dr. Hawes, both as a preacher and as a pastor; but it gives us pleasure to say that the sermons before us have raised him very much in our estimation. There is a bold, honest directness about them, which can scarcely be too highly prized. No one could stand up and say the things which are said here, unless he had the testimony of his people's conscience, as well as his own, that in simplicity and godly sincerity he had discharged his duty among them. Every sentence bears the impress of a high conscious integrity.

His doctrinal synopsis is full and satisfactory. We occasionally detect in it a phraseology somewhat different from that which we, as Old School Presbyterians, prefer to use. Still, we are gratified to see that the *things themselves* are here. This synopsis includes the existence and government of God; the personal distinctions of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; the utterly ruined state of man by nature; the necessity of a divine influence to change the heart; the vicarious and all sufficient atonement of Christ; the subtlety and truth of revivals of religion, and the indispensable importance of a holy life. These points are indicated with a freedom and sincerity befitting the man who had thirty years' work before his mind.

The results are such as might have been expected, from the blessing of a covenant-keeping God. Upwards of twelve hundred and fifty have been added to the church during Dr. Hawes' pastoral care of it, and nearly one-half of them on profession of faith in Christ. For the ten past years the contributions for objects of Christian benevolence, besides the sustaining of the gospel among themselves, has averaged \$6000 a year. This speaks well for pastor as well as flock. Happy would it be for Zion's welfare, did all our churches thus bring their tithes into the storehouse.

It is refreshing to read such a review of ministerial fidelity and success. This church—the first planted in Connecticut—has been in existence more than two hundred years. One delightful fact in its annals is, that it has never had a pastor dismissed but by death. Its nine departed ministers all died in the midst of their people, and are buried among them. And we may be allowed to express the hope, that their present valued pastor may finish his course on a spot endeared to him by so many tender associations, after a long life of increasing usefulness, sink quietly to rest.

The Provincial Courts of New Jersey with sketches of the Bench and Bar, a discourse read before the New Jersey Historical Society, By Richard S. Field. New York, published for the Society by Butler & Welford. 1849. pp. 324.

This is the third volume published under the auspices of the New Jersey Historical Society. It is an honour both to the author and to the society. It cannot fail to add to the reputation already acquired by that body, for its prompt and efficient efforts to rescue from oblivion, the names and the deeds of the founders of our commonwealth and the early administrators of our laws. The task undertaken by Mr. Field, he has performed with uncommon candour, taste and judgment, and the result is, that we have a

truly readable book; and that too on a subject which at first sight might seem to be one of limited interest, and in no small degree of dry detail. But it is far otherwise; the details being no more than sufficient to impress our minds with the truthfulness of the narrative; while the different views entertained by those who had the greatest influence in moulding our institutions, the delineations of their several characters, and the motives that influenced their most important measures, all given in an attractive style, serve to rivet the attention, and to awaken an interest as unexpected as agreeable.

Mr. Field's account of the Provincial Courts of New Jersey has impressed us deeply with the conviction, that the high standing of many members of the New Jersey Bar, within our memory, and the adherence of this State to the principles and practice of the Common Law, are to be ascribed very much to the learning and ability of her first Judges. Not that they were more learned than their successors, but that they were learned in their profession, and that they laid a broad and solid foundation, upon which those who come after them have reared a noble superstructure. And it is our candid belief that in no state is there better security for the preservation of life and property, and that this under God is owing to wise and wholesome laws faithfully administered and enforced.

New Jersey yet needs a historian who shall give us a well digested and compact narrative of her early settlement, her various changes of civil polity, her advances in the arts, her resources, and her capabilities: and from the happy manner in which he has delineated the Provincial Courts of his native State, we are persuaded that it would be difficult to find one who would be so competent as Mr. Field to write a History of New Jersey, which shall be at the same time pleasing and instructive to the man of letters, and to the less cultivated reader.

Parish Churches; being perspective views of English Ecclesiastical structures, accompanied by plans drawn to a uniform scale, and letter-press descriptions. By R. & J. A. Brandon. London. imp. 8vo.

Bibliomania in the Middle Ages; or sketches of bookworms, collectors, Biblestudents, scribes, and illuminators. By F. S. Merryweather. London. 12 mo.

The Life and Times of John Calvin, the Great Reformer. Translated from the German of Paul Henry, by Henry Stebbings. 2 vols. 8vo. London.

Biblical Cyclopædia; a Dictionary of Eastern Antiquities, &c. By John Eadie, LL.D. London: 8vo.

Luther's Werke: vollständige Auswahl seiner Hauptschriften, herausgegeben von Otto von Gerlach, D.D. 24 vols. complete. Berlin & R. Garrigue, N. Y.

- The Incarnation, or Pictures of the Virgin and her Son. By Rev. Charles Beecher. With an Introduction by Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe. New York. Harpers.
- Gieseler's Ecclesiastical History. Translated from the German by Samuel Davidson, LL.D. London.
- A Popular Life of George Fox, the First of the Quakers; by Josiah Marsh, a member of the Established Church. Henry Longstreth. Philadelphia.
- Religion teaching by example; or Scenes from Sacred History. By Richard W. Dickinson, D.D. Second Edition. R. Carter. New York.
- Germany, England, and Scotland; or Recollections of a Swiss Minister. By J. H. Merle d' Aubigné, D.D. Carter & Brothers.
- A Manual of Ancient Geography and History, by William Putz, Edited by the Rev. Thomas K. Arnold, M. A. 12mo. D. Appleton & Co.
- The Heroes of Puritan Times: With an Introduction by the Rev. Joel Hawes, D.D. M. W. Dodd. New York.
- The Life of Jesus: critically examined, by Dr. David Frederick Strauss. 3 vols. 8vo. London.
- Humility before Honour, and other Tales by Charlotte Elizabeth; with a brief Memoir of the Author by William B. Sprague, D. D. Albany. E. H. Pease & Co.
- Punishment by Death; its Authority and Expediency. By Geo. B. Cheever D. D. 12mo. J. Wiley. N. York.
- The Philosophy of Religion, by J. D. Morell, A. M. 1 vol. 12mo. D. Appleton & Co.
- Lectures on the Apocalypse. By Christopher Wordsworth, D.D. 8vo. London.
- Letters on the Theory of Probabilities, as applied to the Moral and Political Sciences. Translated from the French of Queletet. By O. G. Downs. 8vo. London.
- The Christian Scholar. By the Author of the Cathedral. † 12mo. London.
- Essays on History, Philosophy, and Theology. By Robert Vaughan. Two vols. 12mo. London.

Nineveh and its Remains. By Austen Henry Layard, Esq., D. C. L. With an Introductory Note; by Edward Robinson, D. D., LL. D. Two vols. 8vo. G. P. Putnam: New York.

Roorbach's Bibliotheca Americana; or List of all Books published in the United States since 1820. Putnam.

Phaedon; or a Dialogue on the Immortality of the Soul. By Plato. Translated from the original Greek, by Madame Dacier, with notes and emendations. William Gowans: New York.

The Improvement of the Mind. By Isaac Watts, D. D. New York: A. S. Barnes & Co.

A Discourse on the Influence of Diseases on the Intellectual and Moral Powers. By Joseph Mather Smith, D. D. New York.

Natural History of Enthusiasm. By Isaac Taylor. 12mo. Carter and Brothers. New York.

An Essay on the Union of Church and State. By the Rev. Baptist W. Noel. 12mo. Harpers.

Notes on the Prophecies of the Apocalypse. By H. F. Burder, D. D. London: Ward & Co. 8vo.

Correspondance inédite de Mabillon et Montfaucon avec l'Italie. Three Vols. 8vo. Paris. 1847.

The Congregational Tune Book. By L. Mason and G. J. Webb. Tappan, Whittemore & Mason. Boston. 1849.

The Timbrel, a Collection of Sacred Music, &c. By B. F. Baker and J. B. Woodbury. Boston. 1848.

The Duty of the Church in Times of Trial By J. C. Hare. One vol. 8vo. London.

The Works of Thomas Reid; now fully collected, with selections from his unpublished letters: Preface Note and Supplementary dissertations. By Sir William Hamilton, Bart. 8vo. London.

Memoirs of the Rev. J. Pratt, B. D. 8vo. London. 1849.

Christ Receiving Sinners. By the Rev. John Cumming. London.



The Annual Address delivered before the New York State Medical Society, and Members of the Legislature at the Capitol, Feb. 6, 1849. By Alexander H. Stevens, M. D., LL. D. Published by the Society.

Man, his Constitution and Primitive Condition. A Contribution to Theological Science. By John Harris, D. D. London. Ward & Co. 8vo.

A Doctrinal, Practical, and Experimental Treatise on Effectual Calling. By the Rev. James Foote, A. M., minister of the Free East Church, Aberdeen. 8vo. Edinburgh. Johnstone.

Lecture on the Gospel according to Luke. By the Rev. James Foote, A. M., minister of the Free East Church, Aberdeen. Second edition. Three vols. 12mo. Edinburgh. Johnstone.

The Prophecies of Isaiah, earlier and later. By Joseph Addison Alexander, Professor in the Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J. Re-printed under the editorial superintendence of John Eadie, LL. D., Professor of Biblical Literature to the United Presbyterian Church. Glasgow and London. One volume. 8vo. pp. 968.

Horæ Hebraicæ: an attempt to discover how the Argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews must have been understood by those therein addressed; with Appendices on Messiah's Kingdom, &c., &c. By George, Duke of Manchester. London. Nisbet & Co. 8vo.

A Treatise on the Deity of Jesus Christ, and on the Doctrine of the Trinity. By the late Mr. Sergeant Sellon. Edited by the Rev. E. J. Marsh, M. A. London: Nisbet & Co. 8vo.

The History of England from the accession of James II. By Thomas Babington Macaulay. Volumes I. and II. New York. Harpers. 8vo. One of three American editions.

Biblia Hebraica, Secundum editiones Jos. Athiae, Joannis Leusden, Jo. Simonis Aliorumque, imprimis Everardi Van Der Hooght, D. Henrici Opitii, et Wolfii Heidenheim, cum additionibus Clavique Masoretica et Rabbinnica Augusti Hahn. Nunc denuo recognita et emendata ab Isaaco Leeser, V. D. M. Synagogae Mikve Israel, Phila. et Josepho Jaquet,

V. D. M. Presbyter. Prot. Epis. Eccles. U. S. Editio Stereotypa. New York and London: Wiley. Philadelphia: J. W. Moore. 8vo. pp. 1416.

**The Lands of the Bible, Visited and Described, in an Extensive Journey undertaken with special reference to the promotion of Biblical Research and the advancement of the cause of Philanthropy.** By John Wilson, D. D., F. R. S., Honorary President of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, Missionary of the Free Church of Scotland, &c. Edinburgh: Whyte & Co. Two vols. 8vo.

**Sermons preached at the Chapels Royal of St. James's and Whitehall.** By the Hon. and Rev. Baptist W. Noel, M. A. London: Nisbet & Co. 12mo.

**Poole's Annotations on the Bible.** A new edition. Three vols. 8vo. London: Nisbet & Co.

**Hebrew Theocracy; a Small Treatise intended for Sabbath Schools and Christian Families.** By J. Cogswell, D. D. New Brunswick. J. Terhune. 12mo. pp. 107.

**Gillies' Historical Collections, relating to remarkable periods of the success of the gospel.** Published originally in 1754, and now re-printed with a Preface and continuation to the present time. By the Rev. Horatius Bonar, Kelso. 8vo. London: Nisbet & Co.

**Synchronology, a Treatise on the Harmony between the chronology of the ancient nations and that of the Holy Scriptures.** With Tables, Genealogies, &c. By the Rev. Charles Crosthwaite. London: Parker. 8vo.

**Rational Psychology: or the Subjective Idea and Objective Law of all Intelligence.** By Laurens P. Hickok, D. D., Professor of Christian Theology in the Theological Seminary of Auburn. Auburn: Derby, Miller & Co. 1849. 8vo. pp. 717.

By rational psychology is meant psychology as determined a priori by the reason, instead of by experience. The appearance of such a volume in this country, we consider remarkable and portentous. It shows that the new philosophy has found a congenial soil, and is likely to take deeper root among us than we were disposed to think. This work is as formidable as the Critique of the Pure Reason by Kant. It is a real study to peruse it, demanding an amount of time which we have not been able to command.

A simple annunciation is all such a book needs, to draw towards it the attention of the few for whom it was written.

A Sermon on Christian Psalmody, By Rev. Edwin Cater, A. M. Preached at the Lebanon church, Fairfield District, S. C. Columbia, S. C.

Unity of Christ and Believers. By Rev. James Nourse, A. M. Philadelphia: 1848.

The Church of Christ, in its being, and in its relation to divinely appointed ordinances. The Sermon before the Directors of the Protestant Episcopal Society, for the promotion of Evangelical knowledge, at their annual meeting in the church of the Epiphany, Philadelphia, October 25, 1848. By Charles Petit McIlvaine, D.D. Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in the Diocese of Ohio.

The evangelical portion of the Episcopal church in this country have, as we understand, determined to unite in a society for the promotion of evangelical knowledge, as a means of counteracting the progress and productions of the Oxford Romanism which has assumed so threatening an aspect here as well as in England. Very appropriately to the design of the Society, Bishop McIlvaine selected the nature of the Church as the topic for the first annual sermon. This is the hinge of the whole controversy. If the church be, as this sermon teaches, the body of true believers, then Puseyism and Romanism are built upon the sand.

Narratives of Pious Children. By Rev. George Hendley. American Tract Society.

Children Invited to Christ. By a Lady. American Tract Society.

Hymns for Infant Minds. By Jane Taylor. American Tract Society.

A Dictionary of the German and English Languages: indicating the accentuation of every German word, containing several hundred German Synonymes, together with a classification and alphabetical list of irregular verbs, and a dictionary of German abbreviations, compiled from the works of Hilpert, Flügel, Grieb, Heyse, and others. In two Parts. I. German and English. II. English and German. By G. J. Adler, A. M., Professor of the German Language and Literature in the University of the City of New York. New York: D. Appleton & Co. Philadelphia: George S. Appleton. 1849. Royal 8vo. pp. 848 and 522.

Prof. Adler is already extensively known as a philosophical linguist by his admirable grammar of the German language. This Dictionary is a noble monument both of his skill and industry. It is far the best, for all the common uses of a reader of German, that we are acquainted with. The extended title page, which we have copied, gives a clear idea of the character of the work. It is beautifully printed, and by every device of arrangement and type, the ease of consultation is promoted. It has, therefore, every recommendation a work of the kind can well possess.

Two Discourses on the Popular Objections to the Doctrine of Election. By Henry A. Boardman, D. D. Pastor of the Tenth Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia. Philadelphia: William S. Young, Printer; North Sixth street.

These are sensible, well written discourses; and from the earnest desire of men of high standing in society to have them published, it is evident, that they were not only seasonable, but produced a salutary impression when delivered.

It does not appear to have been the object of the preacher to enter into a thorough and profound investigation of this doctrine, which work has frequently been done by learned theologians; but the object of these discourses was, to furnish a satisfactory answer to some of the popular objections so commonly entertained by many against this doctrine; which is clearly revealed in the Holy Scriptures, and was firmly held by all the churches of the Reformation.

The objections are shown to be founded on a misapprehension of the true nature of the doctrine of election; or on a mistaken view of the natural condition of the human race, as in a fallen and ruined state. If all men were not justly exposed to the wrath of God, there would be no foundation for this doctrine. But if that be the doctrine of scripture, as all would have perished if justice had had its natural course, so the leaving a part of the race in the condition into which they fell by transgression, cannot be considered as doing them injustice. The election of a part does no injury to the rest. Why a part were chosen to salvation is a question which we cannot answer otherwise than by ascribing it to the "good pleasure" and sovereign will of God. He has infinitely good reasons for all his purposes and acts, but does not always choose to make them known to men. The author of these discourses has clearly shown that there is nothing in this doctrine, when rightly understood, which has any tendency to discourage sinners, so as to prevent them from repenting of their sins, and coming to Christ for salvation. Indeed, if the doctrine were fully comprehended, it would appear that God's electing love furnishes the only ground of the hope of salvation to sinners. We would therefore recommend these discourses to the careful perusal of such persons as are perplexed on account of this doctrine. It is an important truth, that the decrees of God do not interfere with the free agency of man.



## CONTENTS OF NO. II.

ART. I.—The Natural History of Man; Comprising Inquiries into the modifying influence of Physical and Moral Agencies on the different tribes of the Human Family. By J. C. Prichard, M. D. - - - - -	159
ART. II.—The Primacy of the Apostolic See Vindicated. By Francis Patrick Kenrick, Bishop of Philadelphia. - - - -	174
ART. III.—1. Baptism, with reference to its Import and Modes. By Edward Beecher, D. D.	
2. Infant Baptism a Scriptural Service, and Dipping unnecessary to its Right Administration; containing a Critical survey of the leading Evidence, Classical, Biblical, and Patristic; with special reference to the work of Dr. Carson, and occasional strictures on the views of Dr. Halley. By the Rev. Robert Wilson, Professor of Sacred literature for the General Assembly, Royal College, Belfast. - - -	206
ART. IV.—A Memoir of the Life of James Milnor D. D., late Rector of St. George's Church, New York. By the Rev. John S. Stone, D. D., Rector of Christ Church, Brooklyn. -	236
ART. V.—Robert Burns; as a Poet, and as a Man. By Samuel Tyler, of the Maryland Bar. - - - - -	251
ART. VI.—God in Christ; Three Discourses delivered at New Haven, Cambridge, and Andover; with a preliminary Dissertation on Language. By Horace Bushnell. - - -	259
QUARTERLY LIST OF NEW PUBLICATIONS. - - - - -	298



THE  
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JULY 1849.

---

No. III.

---

ART. I.—*Annual Report of the Board of Missions of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, in the United States of America. Presented to the General Assembly, May, 1849.*

As a fruit of the Spirit of Christ in the church, and of the motions of that Spirit towards its proper manifestation, the Annual Reports of our Board of Missions are signs of the times. These yearly statements of the aims and results of our activity in the natural and legitimate direction of true Christianity, indicate a method and a scale of operations, honorable to the zeal and wisdom of the Board and its agents, and gratifying to the church; and while these operations are far behind the ability of the church and perhaps behind our advancement in some other things, they come from the spirit of the gospel, and are destined, as the gospel prospers, to a vast enlargement. While the same is true of the other Boards of our church, we would here offer a few hints concerning the ground of our system of Domestic Missions, for the sake of the bearing of our remarks on the nature and extent of our work.

The first Christian Missionary was the Lord Jesus Christ. He was sent from the bosom of heavenly love to seek and to save that which was lost. He bore the missionary toils and privations. He came from light into darkness. Though rich, he became poor; made himself of no reputation, took upon him the form of a servant, lived and laboured, in a condition assumed entirely for his benevolent ends, amongst the wicked and the miserable, and as it were, away from his glorious home.

Jesus Christ was a Domestic Missionary. We refer to his relations according to the flesh. He came to his own. From the days of Abraham he had had a people in the world whom he called his own, as distinct from all others as a people could be. Through the ages preceding his earthly mission, while its nature, its objects, and its very time, were the theme of prophetic celebration, it was strictly defined as having immediate and primary reference to the people he called his own. The Salvation of Israel, the Hope of Israel, the Deliverer of his people, and other like expressions, have their origin in this patriarchal idea; and when other people are mentioned as sharing the benefits of this mission of the Son of God, they appear as accessions to Israel. "Nations that knew thee not shall come to thee."

At the advent of our Lord, this view of his national relationship is revived with solemn emphasis and decision. The register of genealogy is produced to prove his Jewish descent, and even to secure for him the advantage of a name the most honourable in the annals of the nation. He acknowledges and honours his countrymen. He keeps their civil and religious laws. The fathers, the prophets, the patriots of the nation, he venerates for the nation's sake. He vindicates the religious distinction of that people, and declares his purpose of exalting the memory of their tribes forever. To the woman of Samaria, he asserts the religious superiority of the Jews, and implies his own acknowledgment of affinity and identity with them. "Ye worship ye know not what; we know what we worship; for salvation is of the Jews." He speaks of showing favour to a woman of Syro Phenicia as casting the children's bread to the dogs. He pronounces his blessing on the house of Zaccheus with peculiar emphasis, "forasmuch as he also is a son of Abraham." He enforces his self-defence for healing on the Sabbath by stating



that the sufferer is "a daughter of Abraham." And as a comprehensive explanation of his general course, he says, "I am not sent but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel."

This national partiality of the Saviour made its impression. The disciples felt it, and revealed it. By this apparent exclusiveness of their Lord, their own Jewish predispositions seemed to be allowed, and even commended and enjoined. So firm was the prepossession which survived his personal example, that Peter made conscience of refusing to teach a Gentile, till relieved from his scruples by a special revelation.

The divine election of that people to such a connexion with the spiritual dispensation, suggests an important view of the relation of a Christian nation as such to the kingdom of Christ. This view we wish here to unfold.

When the Word was made flesh in the bosom of a national organization he taught the national relations of Christianity. The earthly life of Jesus was spent in the sphere of a citizen. The Saviour of the world became a member of a civil and religious community. He became in fact, and in spirit, a Jew. How many of his acts and words seemed the genuine offspring of love for his Hebrew kindred. The eternal scheme of his mediation, while it guided all his earthly movements, allowed him the free adoption of his temporary and earthly associations. Though he always spoke the words and did the works of his Father, though he spoke and acted under the general direction of those laws of his mission which lay remote from human observation, his proximate reasons for saying and doing every thing then and so, were the exigencies of his occasions. His plan involved the national element; his earthly life assumed accordingly the national relations and spirit. He came as the great Expected of the Jews. He was in covenant with them from times of old. He had made their history a catalogue of wonders. While he deprecated and denounced their degeneracy, and wept for their misery, he still glorified their name. He espoused their cause as being himself a Jew; allows his national affinities to pervade his whole spirit; promises those of his people who should receive him, peculiar peace and honour in his kingdom, announces his new administration as only a sequel to the old covenant established upon better promises, and gives his

earthly labours to the land of his birth, and to his brethren according to the flesh.

We feel no motive for attempting to divest our Lord of the proper national partialities. We are deterred from such an attempt by the whole tenor of his earthly history. We concede to him all the patriotic sentiments natural to a good man, and are free to allow them the influence over the Saviour's feelings and actions towards his people which belongs to them as principles of a pure mind. When we witness the subjection of his divine powers to the conditions of humanity in this world, and remember how commonly he wrought his divine works under human impulse; when we hear his withering sentence against the fig-tree which had failed to supply his human want; when we see him calling the dead from their graves with the tear of compassionate humanity in his eye; we discern no repugnance between the laws of the human nature in their full scope, and the laws of the divine; and nowhere does the harmony of the two appear more clear and more glorious than in this free adaptation of himself and of his kingdom to the national instinct of mankind.

The merciful regards of the Saviour embraced the world. His missionary precept required the propagation of the gospel "to every creature." But without turning to follow the spirit and power of the gospel in its great work of Foreign Missions, we would trace the law of national Christianization; a principle evidently respected by the Saviour in his earthly life, and in the methods of his spiritual administration;—a principle requiring earnest obedience from any people who wish to belong to the kingdom of Christ, and who wish to conduct their efforts for the world abroad, with due efficiency and success.

Christianity in its sure and universal diffusion, is destined to regard the national ties. The Saviour yielded most condescending regard to the principle of national unity. This points out the social character and motions of Christianity on its way to its destined triumph. The law of national unity is everywhere presupposed in the Saviour's scheme of gospel propagation, and will help us here to the true explanation of his way of introducing himself and his gospel to the world.

To prepare the way for the national relations of his incarnation, he rears a nation in the course of nature; calling first an

individual as head of a household, making a covenant with him as the progenitor of a peculiar people, and assuring him that the dispensation of heavenly favour should proceed in the line of his posterity, and upon the national scheme; an instructive and sublime anticipation of his future personal connexion with the world. He elects of old, and maintains for ages as his own, the people with whom he purposes in due time, to join himself by blood. He sanctifies the national affinities to his service, as he has always done those of the family. He encompasses himself with these sacred relationships. He comes as an Israelite to deliver Israel. As the Redeemer of men took not the nature of angels, but the nature of man, to communicate grace through human affections, so the Redeemer of Israel took not the nature of a Gentile, but of the seed of Abraham, to communicate grace through the national ties. Tracing his lineage on the public records from David, the heart and centre of the Hebrew nationality, he falls, as the heavenly gift of light and life, into the bosom of the nation, and blends his immaculate humanity with the earthly qualities and conditions of his chosen people. In his person Christianity revealed its national predisposition. It teaches the religious unity of a nation; and the ground of that religious responsibility of a nation as such, which appears so prominent in the dealings of God with mankind.

The nation, as to its elements, begins in the family. There, the unity of interest and character leads us to expect a unity of accountability and destiny. As a system of life, a natural organization, the family is as really one, as a man is one. The prosperity and honour of the family each member enjoys, the adversity and disgrace of the family each member suffers. The family is, in an interesting sense, an enlargement of the individual. By joining families in a community, you create a further enlargement, and have unity still. You have multiplied the members, but have yet one body. There is one interest, one character. The prosperity and honour of the community each citizen enjoys, the adversity and disgrace, each suffers and laments. The family is an enlargement of the individual the nation is an enlargement of the family.

The nation, as one, has its duties to itself and to others. When men, according to their nature, have taken their social organization, they become national subjects of the Government of God.



There are divine laws for nations as for individual men. Their rewards and penalties, though confined to the present life, the only life of nations, are often distinctly set forth, are dispensed by rule, and are employed as incitements to virtue in the individual members. God speaks to nations, as such. He directs, warns, reprovcs, threatens them. There are national sins; and ways to punish them. When men join hands to work evil, and use their social organization to break the law of God, he is wont to send his judgments through the instruments by which they broke his law, to cause their social organization to hasten the work of destruction to the wicked and to make it the more dreadful. When men do right by nations, joining hands to honour God and keep his laws, he has national blessings for them. He can send his rewards through the national organization to individual hearts, and make the government that honours him a blessing to all the subjects. Nations, like men, are righteous or wicked, and their righteousness blesses or their wickedness curses their members. Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people.

The Lord calls nations as such into his service. When they offer their homage through their rulers or other official organs, he accepts it; and often through those organs, in return, does he distinguish them with national powers and honours. "The Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising. Kings shall minister unto thee; the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish."

It belongs to this plan of taking a nation in the mass for religious purposes, that the mass be Christianized throughout. A general evangelical virtue, congenial to the work of the Spirit on individual men, must be diffused through the nation. As God rears a plant from the soil no less by tempering the hemisphere than by specific appliances to the root and the blade, so he conducts his moral discipline of men as much by the common allotments and motions of a nation as by direct dealing with particular persons. "The kingdom and the greatness of the kingdom is given to the people of the saints of the Most High." The nation, impregnated with a religious virtue, instinct with that intellectual vigour and refinement, and those sentiments of order and peace which please God and adorn mankind, becomes the garden of the Lord for the culture of the



spiritual man, where every element of soil and air yields nourishment and strength and beauty to the plants of grace. "The wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad for them, and the desert shall rejoice and blossom as the rose. All things are yours; whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life or death, or things present or things to come, all are yours."

Such a vineyard of the Lord is the glory of the earth. God is her wall of defence. A nation formed and pervaded by the spirit of the Gospel is impregnable. No weapon formed against her can prosper. Her power will be chiefly known as an agent of benevolence; her science shall waken and guide the intellect of the world; her arts shall win and humanize mankind; her wealth shall be at once the fruit and nourishment of her virtue, and her morals the sensible pulsations of inward truth and righteousness. When the church thus takes up the social organizations of men as the instruments of her work, puts on the natural refinements as a part of her beautiful attire, commands the wealth of the world for her works of love, and breathes the spirit of her doctrines into the social habits of the people, she reveals the true nature and power of her life, and accomplishes her earthly destiny.

The heritage of citizenship in such a nation is the greatest of earthly blessings. It brings our temporal destiny into connexion with that of the kingdom of Christ. A truly Christian country is the sanctuary of all that is dear to man on earth. Knowledge is there, and liberty, the security of all personal rights, and true and progressive civilization; incitements to pure thought and beneficent action; the aids of spiritual growth, and the encouragements of hope; all the beauty and all the fragrance of a field which God hath blessed. The Lord provides, in such a country for the furtherance of his work in the hearts of men. The Christian owes religious duties to his country. They are duties to God. God and our country! The Christian citizen of an evangelized nation may regard his country as an abode of the church, and love his country the more without loving the kingdom of Christ the less. The more he is a patriot, the more he may be a Christian. His Christian spirit and obedience may flow largely through the patriotic

channel; and he will seek the prosperity of his country, for the same end for which the Lord upholds it;—the glory of Christ.

All complete religion in this world partakes of this patriotic element; the high principle which represents a man to himself as a free and accountable constituent of a nation, whose character he contributes to form, and whose history involves his own. This is one of those nobler sentiments of human nature, which Christ cherished, and which are taken up, refined and exalted by the Spirit of Christ in the Christian. He is the Christian patriot who loves his country as the garden of the Lord; who delights to view it as the spot where the Lord has planted and is nourishing a branch of his vine; where "the powers that be" are a defence and a help to Zion; where the policy and the laws of the nation presume Christianity, recognize its obligations, and in their way and measure do it honour. It is one of the clearest dictates of piety to embrace such a country with fervent love, and serve it with unmeasured devotion.

The confluence of patriotism and piety in a sincere and intelligent Christian forms a living continuation of the patriotic submission and sympathy of the Saviour. He regarded and treated the nation as one; a large family; and there was the more consanguineous import in this view of the Jewish nation, from the relation of the whole, except proselytes, to Abraham their common father. But this blood relationship was not the essence of nationality; as mere consanguinity is not the sole ground of the family constitution. The confederate tribes of Israel had their national institutions common to all, and their national character and interests. Their one government gave unity to the body; and made them one organization; and with that body thus made one they became personally incorporate, and treated the whole as vitally concerned in his mission. He recognized their nationality in his offer of the Gospel. Not less solemnly and impressively did he recognize it in their rejection of the Gospel. The individuals who believed received their spiritual salvation; while even they, as parts of the rejected nation were exposed to memorable calamity and distress. The nation, by the act of its supreme authority, had set the Son of God, at nought, and by wicked hands, had put him to death. The guilt of the deed was a national guilt. It brought a national retribution. The religion of Jesus Christ gained no

place in the public councils of that people. It received no homage from their laws and customs; no respect from their public proceedings. On the contrary every national demonstration was against it. The acts of Christ were wrested into constructive violations of the civil and religious law of the nation; and the sin of crucifying the Lord of glory, in which a few only were actively engaged, was visited upon the whole. The catastrophe of that people is an awful example of God's dealing with men by nations, to show each man how much his welfare depends on the course of the nation to which he belongs.

The natural grounds for such indiscriminate visitations commend themselves with peculiar force to the Christian citizen. The civil organization, with its unity of action, of interest, and of aim, may fitly bear a unity of responsibility. Its texture of interest and sympathy facilitates the diffusion of suffering; while such compendious retribution from the righteous judge of nations satisfies the common sense of mankind, from the presumption that among the individuals involved in the suffering there has been a common assent to the sin. We thus bring our civil affinities and interests into the kingdom of God, and extend our religious regards to whatever belongs to our country. The Christian patriot carries his country on his heart before God; laments her sins, and confesses them with the same humiliation he feels for his own, and regrets every law of the nation and every usage which expresses or occasions disrespect for the law and the Gospel of God. The moral degeneracy of his country he feels as his own dishonor. A lack of religious instructions and of Christian privilege, in any quarter, he feels as his own privation. He hears the voice of God to the nation as addressed to himself. In his daily confessions he answers to God for the sins of the nation; and prays for the power which can guide the public sentiments and acts in the way of righteousness. As a member of the body politic, he receives the divine word as a national blessing, and owning his responsibility for its due improvement, he takes heed that the light which is in his country be not darkness.

In no other country on the face of the earth can these sentiments glow with such warmth, and act to so high purpose as in our own. Let a Christian contemplate himself in the character of an American citizen; let him consider his country as a



nursery of the Church, and dwell upon those facts of her youthful life which have made her already the light of the world. Every chapter of her history is original; without precedent, without parallel. Many shores have been colonized by adventurous enterprize. But there is known to history one land only which was colonized by Christians to obtain for themselves and their posterity the free enjoyment of their religion. The colonists of this country were not heathens, who first filled the land with their idols, and were afterwards converted by the missionaries of Christianity. They were not men of mere worldly ambition who sought room for the expansion of their restless enterprize. They were Christians, who desired to worship God with free and pure hearts; who felt a check upon their freedom, and came hither to escape it; and whom God sent to raise up a nation on this ground from Christian blood. With the word of God in their hands, and his spirit in their hearts, they organized their communities, founded their schools, built their sanctuaries, and arranged the order of their worship. They withstood the encroachments of power by the instinct of conscious right. When their favorite principle of liberty was assailed, they rose in its defence. When protection hardened into oppression, they severed the political ties and stood for independence. And now, to the descendants of those Christian heroes, and the heirs of their freedom, their memory is consecrated by their zeal for the Gospel. The Christian relations of our civil polity have come from that source. Those laws which guard the church in the use of her rights and powers, the civil authorities which stand as an inclosure of Zion here, have risen on that foundation. We are a temple of God; its courts, the state; its sanctuary, the church. May church and state fulfil their glorious design.

Look, now, through our social constitution upon our prospects. In the mutual relation of church and state, our country appears to us just as we would have it, in the perfection, not indeed of social and moral condition, but of adaptation to the work of religious culture. Only let the people be intelligent enough to understand their moral interests, and virtuous enough to consult them; let knowledge, patriotism and Christianity unite in our character, and direct our course, and we have the perfection of external arrangements for religious improvement. The sup-



porters of Christianity here are not the rulers, but the people. Whatever the character, the principles, the aims of men in power, while our constitution remains inviolate, the keys of knowledge and virtue are held by the people. It belongs not to our government to build our churches, to appoint and sustain our ministry, or to assign its duties. It is not through the civil arm that the people support their Christian institutions. They apply their support to the church with their own hands. No paternal sovereignty judges for us how many or what sort of religious institutions will be best for us. The people judge for themselves, and when the Christian sentiment of any branch of the church deems it desirable to increase the religious privileges of any portion of the country, it can do it in its own way. This is one of the advantages of the friends of Christianity in this land.

This country, which we may gratefully call our own, and not the dominion of any earthly monarch, distinguished already above all other lands, and destined, as we hope, and as many signs foretel, to unparelled exaltation as an abode of the church, has received the light of life as a national blessing. It is a gift to the nation. Every citizen has a share in it. Every citizen is, in his measure, responsible for the due improvement of it. We have a joint interest in the moral welfare of this nation; an interest which may well reconcile us to our joint responsibility for the proper use of our Christian institutions. How can a Christian citizen of such a country be content to see any portion of his country covered with spiritual darkness. It must seem to him as a blemish in his own estate. A Christian, in these United States, however sound and comprehensive his doctrine, and peaceful his religious experience, unless he is afflicted for the spiritual desolation of his country, must yet accuse himself of views too narrow for an American citizen. He has not yet grown into a proper and essential constituent of his Christian state. A nation of such Christians would not be a Christian nation. His Christian element does not yet flow into the channel of his civil relations. He is a Christian only in part. He may be a Christian parent, interweaving all his religious practices, with his domestic relation; he may be Christian in his occupation, pursuing his labor with Christian motives; but he is not a Christian citizen. His religion reaches

not his country. His patriotism is unevangelized. His Christian sentiment and character, shrunk far within his civil dimensions, denied a share in the defence and use of his civil rights, and not pervaded by his natural affinity for his country, leave to him the form of citizenship, without the power. As a patriot he is not risen to newness of life. One branch of affection in him has only its natural properties. It has not yet been grafted in, and partakes not of the root and fatness of the olive.

Imperfectly as it has been considered by our people how much depends on them in the diffusion of the light of life through our country, it has not been wholly overlooked. A large and efficient portion of the Christian church have long acted and are still acting under a sense of their responsibility in this matter. Many Christians of nearly all denominations, survey the spiritual wants of our people with patriotic and pious concern, and unite their zeal and strength to spread the work of God and its institutions. They are moved to it by love to God and man, and co-operating with this love is the powerful element of national affinity. The distant and scattered population of our southern and western regions, are a part of our civil body; fellow-citizens, partners with us in the blessings of liberty, and in toil and sacrifice for its support. Their property, their arms, their blood, must contribute, with ours, to the common defence. Our country is their country. But they have not the gospel;—our national heritage from God, given to the nation as much for their sake as for ours. The spiritual circulation of our country is too feeble. The life blood does not go with force enough to the extremities; and those extremities are cold and weak. They are a part of our living system, but have not their due share of life. Yet the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus is exerting itself to supply the defect. It recognizes the civil relation, it blends itself with the national sympathies; it prompts the Christian citizen to give the gospel to his own, as the Saviour came to his own in person. Here is reproduced the Saviour's soul of patriotism, striving to penetrate and illumine the national organization with the laws and the spirit of his holy kingdom.

Thus germinates the system of Domestic Missions. The national instinct is self-conservative; and no sooner is the gospel recognized as a defence and glory to the nation, than the patri-

otic impulse takes the direction of gospel propagation. The Christian instinct is evangelical, spreading the glad tidings of salvation; and in union with patriotism, with which, as we have seen, it was connate in the Saviour, it holds the gospel as the heritage of the nation. This is history. The motions of Christian patriotism in supplying and preventing spiritual destitution appear in the earliest period of our history. And they were, in some points more marked and decisive than they are now. The colonial history of this country contains records of activity, patriotic as well as religious, for the vigorous establishment of gospel institutions among all the people. A community without the gospel was no more to be found than a community without a magistrate. When the time for political independence came, the men who fought and bled for liberty were the men who spread the gospel in the land. And to those primitive Christian patriots, under God, we owe the present enlargement of the church on these shores, the vast facilities for our work of missions, and not improbably, the very existence of our present efficient system. They sent the vital circulation of their social system in full force to the extremities.

Our Domestic Missions are, then, the legitimate offspring of Christian patriotism. As the Christian is a patriot, he lives for his country. As the patriot is a Christian, he claims his country for Christ. This law of Domestic Missions, residing in the nature of a Christian citizen, may be a natural ground of our hope in God that our country shall be supplied with the gospel. The patriotism of Christianity may be expected to do its work wherever Christianity finds a home. For parts of a Christian country to be destitute of the gospel, were as unnatural as for some members of a family to starve while the rest are fed. The water of the same pool never rests at different levels. Our unity as a Christian people necessitates the diffusion of the gospel throughout our borders. The self-diffusive force of Christianity must as surely send its equal impulse through the nation as the nation remains one, and our Christianity retains its virtue.

In this view our Domestic Missions assume the aspect of great power and high promise. They reveal their living contact and incorporation with the Spirit of Christ in the church. Their two elements, patriotism and religion, pertain, the one to



the natural life of civilized man, the other to the life of God. The divine principle joins itself to the human. We might reasonably hope for the Christianization of our country by the sure obedience of Christians to the Missionary precept of the Saviour, as an appeal to their love for him, and their reverence for his authority; for all active Christians respect that command, and are chiefly moved by it to send the gospel to all the nations. Or, we might rest a strong Christian hope for our country, on the natural philanthropy of pure minds, always enlivened by union with pure religion. This also lends its impulse to missions for the world. But to all this we may add to insure the fidelity of our people to their Domestic Missions, that profound and undying love of country, which exerts such power in all right-minded Christians, and was allowed such scope in the Saviour himself. A noble principle,—a sanctified love of country,—the love of Christ in a patriotic heart. We cannot despair of the country unless we despair of the church that is in it.

Our Domestic Missions, then, form one of the brightest features in the aspect of our country. They imply at least a small degree of resemblance to the Saviour. They are a fruit of our religious life. They are an instrument of our religious activity. They confer a great dignity on us as a Christian people. Such is our own Board. It has the seat of its life in the hearts of the members of our church. Through all its process of growth to its present eminence and power, it has been nourished by the spirit of Christ in the hearts of his people. It is not the mere offspring of a calculating policy, either civil or ecclesiastical. It has come not alone from a general philanthropy, nor from sectarian zeal, nor even from the missionary injunction of our Lord, as an expression of authority. It rises out of the national spirit of our Christian people. On this deep and broad foundation it is destined to stand so long as the true gospel dwells in any part of our country, and other parts have need.

The Domestic Missions of this country have every advantage which can commend them to the people and facilitate their work. In this land where church and state have their separate organizations, the church may extend her bounds and fulfil her destiny by her own resources and in her own way. Where church and state are united the church acts through the com-



mon organization, upholding and extending itself by the civil agency. The state becomes agent for the church in spreading the gospel through its jurisdiction. A people unanimous in their Christian views, and united in their Christian work, might find great conveniences in such a system. It would be the natural system for them. But such unanimity has never yet existed where the people were free. There is as yet no free and intelligent country on the face of the earth, where the church can operate through the civil organization without hindrance to her proper work. The state can do the outward part of the work of church extension. It can build houses of worship. It can appoint and maintain an officiating ministry. But the difficulty of keeping the spirit of religion diffused through the public and formal proceedings of a civil government has been found insurmountable wherever the attempt has yet been made. Governments will tend to be as secular in managing the affairs of the church as in other things. Every impulse of the missionary work must come fresh from the hearts of the people.

In this respect our facilities for the propagation of the gospel in our country can hardly be improved. The church in this country has her own organization. She stands separate and complete in herself. Her government is in no way interwoven with the government of the state. She has a circulation and a system of life of her own. She is not compelled to mingle her life blood with the frigid and impure humours of a secular organization. Her divine light is not, by any social necessity absorbed in the opaque body of the state, and lost in the vapors of political strife. She has her character and her destiny to herself. Her members come into her communion, professing her principles and bound to her service. The springs of our missions are in them. The gifts of the church for the spread of the gospel come spontaneously from the people; carrying with them to every point of their application the savour of her sacredness, and then at once, suggesting their origin and ensuring their success.

Thus went such proceedings under Christ and the apostles. The disciples who were sent out two and two were to look for their support directly from the people among whom they laboured. They received only what was willingly given. What

the apostles applied to their own use and the relief of the poor, they received directly from the hands of Christians. The contributions were religious charities. They were not exacted in the name of the government, assimilated to the civil revenue, and appropriated according to political expediency, and as a part of the civil expenditure. They went in their Christian character, and to their Christian ends. The religious interests of this country are under God immediately in the hands of our Christian people. The constitution of the nation leaves this charge on us. The responsibility is our own; and for doing our work effectually, and in the most convenient way, we have all the facilities we can wish.

The broad and firm principles of human nature and religion above stated form the ground of our Domestic Missions. They involve the security of our success. They embody the great persuasive to faithfulness in the cause. Every sincere and intelligent Christian will feel their power. We must either quench both the Spirit of Christ within us and our natural patriotism, or we must give a vigorous support to our system of Home Missions. The example of Christ, and the tendency of the spirit of Christ in his people;—the one objective, a matter of devout and thankful contemplation, the other, subjective, a matter of peaceful and joyful consciousness;—these are the chief sources of action to the true Christian. Let the members of the church of Christ in this country, then, while moved by these principles, consider the connexion of this part of their work with the true prosperity of their country, the welfare of the human family, and the glory of God.

Our country, as we have said, had a Christian origin. We have a high character to maintain. It will be no light matter for us to walk worthy of our early history; it will be no small shame to walk unworthy of it. Our infancy was such as no other nation ever had. Our manhood must correspond to it. Our dereliction would bring a memorable reproach upon Christianity. With a character emblazoned in literature, science, and art, the traces of which can never, without some signal catastrophe, be obliterated from the world; with industry, commerce, wealth, and power, fostered by illustrious Christian endowments, and ample for almost unlimited beneficence, we cannot hope that the disgrace of our delinquency would ever be

forgotten. The republics of antiquity fell without such reproach. It is rather a wonder that they ever lived, than their shame that they died; for they had not "the law of the spirit of life." They had not Christianity. But shame to us, if we quench the light that is in us. Our infamy would be abhorred forever. And where, except in our Home Missions, can we find security against this degeneracy? Without this scheme of carrying the lamp of life before the footsteps of our active and migrating millions, how soon should we see a majority strong, vicious, and bold enough to give us the character, and consign us to the doom, of an ungodly nation.

The proportion of our country, subject, as to its destiny, to the control of our Domestic Missions, gives this cause an overwhelming greatness in our view. Our people will scatter as long as there is room. They will live as far asunder as they can. Our "West" would have no western boundary till it reached the Pacific; and now that we rule from ocean to ocean, our people so abhor a vacuum that they instantly compass and occupy the whole. What but a vast and vigorous system of Domestic Missions can plant the gospel in this immense dispersion, and prevent the small remainder of religion in the settlers from total extinction. When we consider how few of our migratory people have the disposition or the ability to establish and maintain religious institutions for themselves, we see what the older and denser portions of the church have to do. Three-fourths of our whole territory and population, to speak far within the bounds of truth, have already received, or have yet to receive, the beginnings of their religious institutions as a missionary benefaction. The infinite activity of our increasing population leaves no habitable region uninhabited within our bounds. The people will live too far apart, and be too poor, to maintain the institutions of the gospel, and by the time they gain the numbers and ability they will lose the disposition. Over the vast extent of our new settlements, the gospel must be planted by Domestic Missions; and few, very few are the counties in our whole Union, where the church, by her missions, has not something to do.

By our Domestic Missions, the Christians of this age have the character and happiness of the future millions of this country largely in their power. Even by helping to support the

ministry in small congregations, stationary in numbers and ability, and not expecting to become independent, we are acting for coming generations. Such congregations may be thought to be few. Doubtless most beneficiary churches, may be expected to become more willing to exert themselves for their own support, and, without increase of numbers or ability, may be expected soon to sustain themselves. But not a few have their self-sustaining period, indefinitely remote. They are a permanent part of the missionary field. It is a blessed work to give them the gospel ministry; for almost entirely have we the religious character and happiness of those people and of their posterity in our power. But of the new communities, rising with unparalleled rapidity all over the land, especially in the new states and territories, what may we not say? The inhabitants of new settlements are peculiarly susceptible of religious impressions. They have some childlike traits. They amalgamate with each other more readily than the same persons would in older communities. Their first religious teachers will, in a majority of cases, impress on the community its leading features. These impressions are a germ. The future character of the people will be a growth from them. Every one of the old thirteen states bears yet the features of its colonial infancy. It belongs to our Domestic Missions to impress on the infant communities of the land a character which will never fade away.

The Domestic Missions of this country will bear an important part in preserving the union of the states, and in making it a blessing. With such territorial extension as we now have, and such as we seem to many destined to acquire, it were folly to hope for continued union and prosperity, without an equally extensive and operative Christianity. Without religion, there are not interests and sentiments enough common to all our people to give them a ground of unity. In the productions of the earth there is no greater difference between any two continents on the globe, than between different sections of our country. In social institutions and habits, we are as unlike as any two nations on earth who speak a common language. Nothing but the fact of union and a relish for its benefits, can any more bind together the people on opposite sides of the Potomac, the Ohio or the Mississippi, than the people on opposite sides of the St. Lawrence, the Great Lakes or the Rio Grande. The argu-



ments for union from geography and from economy, are no stronger for states now united than for states now divided. The existence of the union, and the certainty that division could come only of evil and produce only evil, are the two considerations on which we must rely to perpetuate our national unity. For the required effect of these considerations, our people must duly appreciate the evil which would lead to disunion and that which would follow, and be content with the compromises and faithful in the mutual offices of morality, covenant and friendship involved in the support and exposition of the constitution. In other words, our security is in our virtue. This virtue comes only of Christianity; and to establish Christianity in three-fourths of our country is the work of our Domestic Missions.

These missions assist the prosperity and glory of our country by hastening the mutual assimilation of our people. We must have one standard of taste and of morals. We must judge alike of the nature and value of liberty, and of the means of preserving it. We must speak one language. We must have manners and customs as similar as our difference of climate and of occupations will allow. We must have a common zeal for the universal education of the people. All facilities must be created for mutual alliance from acquaintance, interest, and love. All this must be sought after with earnestness and on a large scale; for our country is becoming a field for the conflict or the conciliation of all that is heterogeneous in humanity on the face of the earth. Nothing but our Christianity can assimilate our people and by no other means can our Christianity do this than by our Home Missions.

As to the bearing of our Domestic Missions on the condition of the human family: first, it is here alone as yet that the world witnesses a salutary and commanding operation of the true law of liberty. In this view we are a wonder to the nations, and may well be a wonder to ourselves. We are the light of the world. The rays of the sun of freedom which have fallen on this land are reflected with great power on other nations, and though few of the nations seem fully prepared to walk in the light, yet many are now putting forth genuine signs of life. Wo to the world and ourselves if we suffer our liberty to outrun our religion; if we wake the people of the nations to

a consciousness of right and of power, without commending that righteousness by which alone right and power are safe; if we apply to the present susceptible generations of humanity the corrosive compound of freedom and licentiousness. To prevent such shame and wo, will be an invaluable service to mankind. All we do for ourselves in this cause we do for the human race. Our Domestic Missions are doing more for the world than all our other institutions could do without them. Indeed without that thorough diffusion of Christianity among us for which we must rely on Domestic Missions, our political example will do the world more harm than good. If the salt have lost its savour, wherewith shall it be salted.

We are destined to serve all nations by taking many of their people to ourselves. The eyes of all the pilgrims of the world are towards our shores. Thousands of the people of God come here from other lands to lighten their temporal burdens, and breathe the air of spiritual health. Thousands of nominal protestants, with little piety and with none, come hither to seek a worldly portion. To these we have the privilege of tendering the living word, by the hand of our missions. Thousands of Catholics come hither, under a wise direction and for gracious purposes, which they themselves never think of, but the remembrance of which must guide us in our reception and treatment of those people. We should bid them welcome, give them a share of our heritage of freedom. It is not ours to monopolize. It is ours to offer to them. It belongs to all men. We cannot shut out the oppressed of other lands who are drawn hither by the fame of our freedom and happiness, but must give them a place so long as they find their advantage in coming. Even though we had less ambition to multiply, we have other and higher reasons against exclusiveness; and while our statesmen for their reasons, are not exclusive in their laws, how much less shall Christians, for their nobler reasons, be exclusive in their feelings. We must learn not to dread the flow of Romish corruption and infirmity into our ocean of purity and health. If Romanism can flourish in the atmosphere of spiritual truth and freedom with which we trust the merciful Lord is surrounding our country, we need not labour to destroy it; if not, let it come hither to die. It is for us, through the potent agency of our Domestic Missions, and the blessing of the Lord, to keep

the healing virtue of the waters so strong that all the impotent who step into them shall be made whole. This is an important part of the office which we are bound to fulfil, and are partially fulfilling for the world.

Our Home Missions work mightily for the world in the department of commerce. We do business with all mankind. We send to all the nations the harvests of our fields, the products of our workshops, the fruits of our invention, the treasures of our learning, the maxims of our political wisdom. We are to send them also the blessings of our religion. But how shall we ever do this in a measure proportioned to the wants of the world? How small and feeble the rills which are flowing from us to refresh the nations. Fill the fountain that the stream may rise. Elevate the fountain that the stream may flow faster. Cleanse the fountain that the stream may be pure. In other words, enlarge and strengthen our system of Domestic Missions, till the spirit of our purest Christian churches shall pervade the land; till Christian seamanship shall guide all our vessels on the sea, and Christian enterprise engage all our communities on the land; every seaman under our flag being a gospel missionary and every dweller on our shores a labourer and a suppliant for the conversion of the world.

Our Domestic Missions owe a valuable service to the world in the name and behalf of the protestant form of Christianity. Whether the original claim to this continent, either from discovery or settlement be catholic or protestant, whether many catholics or few shall call this land their home, it is here that God is bringing together, for the first time in the Christian era, the three potent elements of religion, intelligence, and freedom, to do their work on all the people of a great nation. Either our favourite theory concerning the natural and appointed relation between freedom of conscience and pure religion is false, or we must expect that the gospel effectually administered here will yield the protestant forms of Christian faith and practice. The progress of the gospel in any country where the popular mind is enlightened and free, must exclude all forms of worship and of government which tend to fetter either the understanding or the conscience. But in order to this, the free mind of the people must be applied to gospel truth. Otherwise we shall have, not probably Romanism, but an ignorance of Christianity and



a perversion of it, and a prostitution of our moral nature, not less criminal and pernicious than the most benighted Romanism; and for this, American Protestantism will be accountable. It is only through the agency of Home Missions, that our protestantism can be saved this reproach. It is only by this that we can prove our antipathy to popery to be the opposition of true piety against sin, and not a mere natural prejudice against those who differ from us. We have the name of a protestant nation. We have to show that, in the only nation under heaven where the people enjoy entire religious freedom, protestantism is not to be associated with infidelity. If our Home Missions may, by the divine blessing, be our instrument of accomplishing this, they will perform an important office for the world.

We only remark further, that it is by these means more than by any other, that our country is to promote the glory of God. She will thus become the glory of the earth, and it will be known and acknowledged in all the world as the handiwork of God. It will be seen that his word is our light, that his laws are the foundation of our government, and that his Spirit is the life of our religion. We are becoming a great and mighty people. Though we sought no conquests, waged no wars, cherished no ambition for national glory, praised not ourselves nor coveted praise from others, if the Lord preserve and bless us, our name must be great in the earth. With such people, territory, climate, science, arts, commerce, laws and religion, for us to exist is to have renown. If we make our Board of Missions the angel flying in the midst of our heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach to all our people, we can regard ourselves as the people of God, and our land as the dwelling place of his glory. By blessing us, he will bless the world and all the ends of the earth shall fear him.

These are only hints of the views which must often arise on this subject to the intelligent Christians of our country. They have great force for the people of our communion. If ever we had a call from God, we have one now, for a vast and speedy enlargement of our Domestic Missions. Men are wanted; men prepared and willing to serve Christ in the ministry wherever a place can be found. Means of support are wanted. Our scale of income and disbursement must be greatly extended. Means must be provided to support men of suitable qualifica-



tions to superintend the operations in the various sections of our great field. Means must be had to support distant and efficient missions on a scale of expenditure equal to that of some of our most expensive foreign missions. And means must be at hand to give the labourer a suitable reward; for no American Christian, worthy of the name, can ask or allow his brother to forego the ordinary comforts of life, in order to serve the church in the Christian ministry.

The last report of our Board, like its predecessors, gives us a view of the gratifying progress of our missions, of the vastness of the field which the Board consider it their duty to occupy, and the energy and faithfulness with which they apply to the work all that is given them by the churches for that purpose. We see the greatness of the work which we have committed to the hands of our Board of Missions; let us promptly supply the means of doing it well.

**ART. II.—1.** *An Inquiry into the alleged Tendency of the Separation of Convicts, one from the other, to produce Disease and Derangement.* By a citizen of Pennsylvania. Philadelphia: E. C. & J. Biddle. 1849.

2. *Prisons and Prisoners.* By Joseph Adshead. London: Longman, Brown, Green, & Longman. 1845.

3. *The Twentieth Annual Report of the Inspectors of the Eastern State Penitentiary of Pennsylvania. Transmitted to the Senate and House of Representatives, March, 1849.* Philadelphia: Printed by Edmund Barrington & George D. Haswell. 1849.

4. *Report on the Condition of the New Jersey State Prison; embracing the Reports of the Joint Committee, Inspectors, Keeper, Moral Instructor, and Physician. Read January 16, 1849, and ordered to be printed.* Trenton: Printed by Sherman & Harron. 1849.

5. *Annual Report of the Inspectors of State Prisons of the State of New York. Made to the Legislature, January 19, 1849.* Albany: Weed, Parsons & Co., Public Printers.

THE reform in the methods of imprisonment and the treat-

ment of prisoners is far less known and appreciated among us, than its remarkable character deserves. It has long been among our general purposes to give our readers some account of the subject; and the materials for the purpose had accumulated upon our hands till it would have been impossible for us to have remained silent much longer. At this juncture, the pamphlet, whose title we have given above, by a citizen of Pennsylvania, came into our hands. So far as the leading controversy in regard to the rival systems of prison discipline is concerned, it seems to us to cover the entire ground with singular ability, and to leave us little else to do than to give a brief account of the nature and progress of the reform, and then refer our readers to the masterly, and as we think, conclusive reasoning of the pamphlet in question.

There is one point of view in which the history of this subject strikes us as important and highly interesting, viz: as an exponent of the ameliorating tendency of that form of civilization which is moulded upon the scriptures, and whose vital element is the religion of the New Testament.

When Howard was appointed Sheriff of the county of Bedford, in England, in 1773, his Christian sensibilities were shocked by the abuses and wretchedness and corruption among the prisoners of all classes, with whom his official duties threw him in contact. Such was the horrible condition of the prisons of that day in England, that the effluvia so affected his own apparel that he assures us that in a post-chaise he could not bear the windows drawn up; and was therefore obliged to travel commonly on horse-back. The leaves of his memorandum-book were often so tainted, that he could not use it till after spreading it an hour or two before the fire; and even the vial of vinegar which he was accustomed to smell as an antidote while he was in these dens of malaria and death, after using it in a few prisons became intolerably disagreeable.\*

He also cites cases where the infection from prisoners at the bar proved so malignant, that "the lord chief baron, the sergeant, the sheriff, and some hundreds beside, died of the gaol-distemper."

In these fearful holes were confined all classes of prisoners

\* Howard's *State of Prisons*. p. 7.

indiscriminately, some of whom were declared by the verdict of a jury, *not guilty*, some, on whom the grand jury did not find such an appearance of guilt, as subjected them to a trial, and some whose prosecutors did not appear against them, who after being confined a few months were dragged back "to rot in gaol," because they were unable to pay sundry prison fees.

Such moreover was the moral corruption bred in the association of these haunts of crime, that in the language of Sir John Fielding, "a criminal discharged generally by the next sessions, after the execution of his comrades, becomes the head of a gang of his own raising." It was this state of things which originated the immortal labours of Howard. And this was the beginning of the noble Christian work of prison reform. The only objects originally contemplated by Howard, were to rescue those prisoners who were held by no crime except inability to discharge prison debts, to classify those who were to be permanent prisoners, so as to check the contaminating effect of unrestricted intercourse, and to improve the sanitary condition of the goals, and furnish better accommodations and better food to the prisoners.

The existence of precisely the same evils and abuses in our own land, led, simultaneously with the philanthropic labours of Howard in England, to the formation of a society in Philadelphia, "for the alleviation of the miseries of public prisons." After years of untiring effort on the part of the members of this society, to mitigate these miseries, they were driven to the conclusion that any material reform or at least any that offered the least hope of reforming the prisoners themselves, was out of the question, so long as the convicts were allowed to associate at all. No classification could prevent the propagation of depravity among prisoners; for such is the nature of depravity that it grows and spreads with certain and fearful rapidity, by the mere power of self-development and self-propagation, independently of the corrupting tendency of more consummate villainy.

This put the Philadelphia Society upon devising a plan for effecting the entire separation of prisoners from each other. It should be observed that this idea resulted from a regard for the moral welfare of the prisoner. It deserves therefore to mark a new era in the history of prison discipline. Heretofore the



whole object had been to punish crime with a view of protecting society. We now find the introduction of a new idea, viz: that of caring for the moral well-being, and if possible, achieving the moral reformation, of the convict. This is essentially a Christian idea; and the effect of its introduction was a complete and radical change in the whole system of discipline, to which criminals were to be subjected. This, therefore, we regard as the true germ of the whole modern reform. It was the insertion of a new life; and the result has been the development of a new organization, in the entire method of treating criminals. It takes off the ban of utter and hopeless condemnation and restores them to the privileges of humanity and makes them in common with all their race the prisoners of hope. All that has been since done, and all that yet remains to be done is but the legitimate carrying out of this idea. It is the wide, and everlasting interests involved in this Christian idea, which explains the deep and engrossing, and when mingled with human passions, in some quarters even fanatical interest, which the discussion of this subject, as we shall see, has aroused.

The form first and most naturally assumed by this idea, was that of solitary confinement without labour. This form, however, was never reduced to trial, and was soon abandoned, on the ground of its undue severity as a punishment. After years of unwearied and philanthropic effort by the Society of Philadelphia and its friends, in developing and advocating their idea of a penitentiary or reformation-prison, the Legislature of Pennsylvania passed an act in 1821, authorizing the erection of the Eastern State Prison or Penitentiary near Philadelphia. The principles to be observed in its construction were these two: 1. That the prisoners were to be kept entirely separate from each other, so that their very persons should be mutually unknown; and 2. that they should be furnished with suitable and sufficient employment. The object of the legislature in adopting this plan, was to repudiate, on the one hand, all attempts to prevent the evils of association either by classifying the prisoners, as in the European gaols, or by allowing them to associate for work during the day, while all intercourse should be prevented by enforcing absolute silence, as in the Auburn Prison; and on the other hand to repudiate equally the plan of entire solitude, by



allowing the requisite amount of intercourse with other persons besides their fellow criminals, and that of shutting up their thoughts to prey not only upon their crimes but upon themselves, by allowing them sufficient daily employment to relieve the tedium of confinement, and furnish agreeable mental occupation. Such were the principles originally laid at the foundation of what is now well known all over the world, as the Pennsylvania system of prison discipline.

In June, 1825, four years after the passage of this act in Pennsylvania, and while the Eastern Penitentiary was in process of erection, a society was formed in Boston "for the improvement of public prisons." The organization of the Boston Society, though long subsequent to that at Philadelphia, was an independent movement, suggested by the very same evils existing in the State Prison at Charlestown. The executive represented the state of things to the Legislature of Massachusetts in a light so revolting, that in 1826, a law was passed, ordering the erection of a new building in Charlestown; the main object of which was to secure the separate confinement of the convicts, and to prevent that association of prisoners to which the fearful evils referred to were justly ascribed. Under the joint recommendation of the executive of the State and the Boston Society the plan adopted for the new prison was that previously in use at Auburn, in New York;—which provided for the separation of the prisoners at night, and allowed their association during the day, while it sought to prevent the corrupting evils of convict-association, by enforcing the most rigid silence.

The true ground upon which this plan was originally adopted at Boston, no doubt, was that it seemed to answer the desired purpose of preventing the contaminating influence of convict society. This was the great root of all the apparent evils which produced the movement towards reform. There was no reason apparent, therefore, for adopting the more cumbrous and expensive and difficult method of providing for the complete separation of the convicts. Having adopted the system known as the Auburn, congregated, or silent system, on the ground just mentioned, the gentlemen at Boston were naturally committed to its defence. It soon became apparent that there were other evils besides the single one of corrupting criminal association, and which this system did not provide for;—as for

example, the fact of being a recognized convict, so discouraging in any attempt to regain public confidence and esteem, and so dangerous in the hands of designing villains, after the term of imprisonment had expired. And moreover it became very questionable, whether the great Christian idea from which the whole reform received its true life,—that, namely, of attempting the moral reformation of the prisoner, could be adequately carried out, upon the congregate plan. It was the view of these considerations rendered perfectly familiar by their longer experience, and their humble but laborious and often disappointed Christian efforts, which had induced the projectors of the Pennsylvania system, to aim at a more complete separation of the prisoners, so as not only to prevent every corrupting association, but all personal knowledge of each other. When these considerations began to urge themselves upon the attention of the gentlemen at Boston, they naturally felt themselves called upon to defend the system to which they were committed. To do this successfully, it was very evident they must be able to produce some valid objection to the Pennsylvania plan of separation, which bore upon its very face the presumption of superiority; on the ground that it not only accomplished more perfectly the great object which all parties had in view, but a great deal besides, to which the congregate plan could make no pretension. It is easy to see how in this state of the case, the reports of the Boston Society came to be filled with strictures and criminations of the Eastern State Penitentiary at Philadelphia. The only possible method of carrying the verdict of society in their favour, was to show that the provisions of the Pennsylvania system were either unnecessary, inoperative or cruel. It so happened that the management of the controversy fell into the hands of parties who were so deeply implicated in the matter, as to render them unscrupulous; and without observing that these several grounds of argument were incompatible, they undertook to establish them all. It was obvious, however, that the most available method for carrying public sentiment was to plant the main battery upon the last mentioned ground. Hence the most extraordinary statements, and the most fanciful, as well as exaggerated pictures of the cruel effects of what was falsely stigmatized as “solitary confinement,” in producing bodily disease and mental fatuity, were annually sent forth in the

Reports of the Society. The more they felt the pressure of the difficulties at home, the more violent became their assaults upon the rival system, in order to bolster up their own confidence and that of the community at large. In this course they were encouraged by two accidental circumstances. In the first place the friends of the Pennsylvania system, relying with calmness and confidence upon the ultimate triumph of truth, and with that modesty which belongs to those who feel that they have the truth on their side, took no measures to counteract the statements of their adversaries, or trumpet the achievements of their favourite measures. And in the second place, the vital statistics of the Philadelphia Prison, for reasons which we shall explain hereafter, furnished some show of foundation for the representations of the Boston Reports.

Under these circumstances it was not strange that the one-sided controversy should gradually run into extreme exaggeration; and as in all other cases that exaggeration gradually worked its own cure. It was as plain as any axiom in mathematics, that gentlemen who had proved their intelligent, untiring and elevated benevolence, by half a century of self-denying devotion to the social and moral welfare of the neglected criminal, could never tolerate, much less become parties in the administration of abuses and cruelties, so inhuman and horrifying as those attributed to the discipline of the Eastern Penitentiary. The inevitable effect of this overdone extravagance, was first to awaken suspicion as to its truth, and next to stimulate the desire to know what the real facts of the case were. Such was the result, as we shall see, not only in Boston, but among the members of the very society from which these statements were annually sent forth; until the work of misrepresentation was at length arrested, four years ago, and a new era in the controversy was opened.

Meantime, however, the Boston Reports had been disseminated with the most commendable diligence and zeal, not only in our own country, but also in Europe. The governments of the old world had been aroused by the labours of Howard and his noble coadjutors and successors, to the enormities practised upon prisoners, to the scandal of every Christian nation on the continent. The earnest discussions waged upon this subject in the United States, found, therefore, not only a philanthropic, but also a national sentiment awakening to its importance; and the



comparative merits of the rival American systems soon became familiar topics of debate, in nearly every country in Europe. The effect of the Boston Reports was precisely what we have described. The statesmen and philanthropists to whom the matter belonged, were soon convinced that those reports were not to be relied upon as impartial sources of knowledge; and having no other means of information accessible to them at home, they wisely determined to send commissioners to America, to investigate the whole matter upon the ground. These commissioners were in all cases men of distinguished abilities, and accomplished education, as well as deeply interested, both as philanthropists and statesmen, in the right settlement of the disputed points. Arbiters better qualified to adjudicate upon the question in debate, could not have been found in Christendom. And so far as any prepossessions could be supposed to exist, the friends of the Auburn system should be the last to complain; for up to the period of their respective visits to America, they had exclusive possession of the ear of the commissioners. And although the manifest unfairness of their special pleading had awakened doubts as to the candour of the argument, or the full truth of their statements, yet it was true in point of fact, as any one might naturally suppose, that most of the commissioners were pre-occupied with some degree of prejudice, against the Pennsylvania system. They came among us, and explored personally and in the fullest manner, both the principles and the working of the respective plans, scrutinizing their results even to the minutest particulars, and studying their bearings in every direction. Now it is a curious fact, considering the liability to prejudice from previous representations, as well as the liability to the adoption of different opinions, in the most unbiassed and candid view of the same facts, that in every case, without a single exception, they reported in favour of the Pennsylvania system; and on the strength of their reports, that system has been introduced by governmental authority, into most of the countries of Europe. It would, we think, be difficult to procure a more fair and conclusive adjudication of any great moral or social question: and if the verdict be not accepted as final by all parties, surely it must be admitted as conclusive against the cry of cruelty and inhumanity, so long and pertinaciously urged by its foes against the plan of separation, and



so commonly admitted by many, who on other grounds would be its fast and unhesitating friends.

In this series of embassies, the first was that deputed by France, and was composed of M. De Beaumont, and M. De Tocqueville. Of the intelligence, ability, and thoroughness of this commission, it is needless to say a word; and the result of their inquiries is well known to have been a decided recommendation of the separation-system. Not perfectly satisfied with this report, as there had been so general and deep a prejudice against the principles it advocated, a second deputation consisting of Messrs. De Metz, Blouet, Davaux and Verel came over; some, if not all of whom, avowed a strong anterior prejudice against the Pennsylvania system. In their report they declare that "since they have seen the system in operation, their opinion has undergone a total change; and it is that very system, which they feel in conscience bound to propose and advocate."\* At a still later period M. Ardit, of the department of the Minister of the Interior, M. Paul Guillot, Avocat de Paris, and M. Epren were sent by the government to England, to inspect the Model Prison at Pentonville near London, constructed on the Pennsylvania or separate plan. After this mature and enlightened consideration, a *projet de loi* was laid before the French Chambers in 1844, by M. Duchatel, Minister of the Interior, and M. Passy, Under Secretary of State, under the authority of the Crown, providing for the national adoption of the separate plan of confinement. The speech of M. Duchatel, introducing this bill, is one of the most comprehensive and powerful arguments, in brief compass, we have ever seen; passing in review every material question in both systems, and giving his final and decided judgment in favour of the plan of separation. The bill was, after full discussion, adopted by the Chambers; and thirty different prisons have been since erected in accordance with its provisions.

After many unsuccessful attempts to mitigate, and if possible remove the crying evils and enormities of the public prisons in England, on the old plan, the Government sent a commissioner to the United States in 1832, to investigate the workings of our Prisons. The commissioner, Wm. Crawford, Esq., fulfilled his

\* See the original letter of M. De Metz addressed to the government.

duty faithfully, and in 1834 presented an elaborate Report, addressed to the Secretary of State for the Home Department. The valuable information embodied in that report, together with the views of the Commissioner, and other evidence on the subject, led to the determination of the government to erect what is termed a Model Prison at Pentonville near London, which was modelled even to its very architecture after the Philadelphia penitentiary, with only some modifications in its details in no way affecting the fundamental principles of the Pennsylvania system.\* In this prison which went into operation in 1842, these principles have again undergone a most thorough and scrutinizing inquiry. Among the Commissioners to whom its supervision was entrusted by the government, we find the names of Lord Wharncliffe, the Duke of Richmond, the Earl of Devon, Lord John Russell, Hon. Charles Shaw Lefevre, Speaker of the House of Commons, and Sir Benjamin Brodie, one of the most distinguished surgeons in England. The Annual Reports of these distinguished individuals to Parliament, furnish a body of the most conclusive testimony, on all the topics brought into the debate. The effect of the confinement upon the health and the mind of the prisoners, as well as upon their moral feelings and character, has been closely observed by the highest medical authority in the kingdom; and the reports before us contain the result. That of 1845, the last we have seen, states that "the health of the prison had been excellent." "During the past year, and up to the present time no case of insanity, hallucination or mental disease of any kind has occurred." "There have been three cases of mortality for seven hundred and forty-one prisoners, or at the ratio of one in two hundred per annum." An inquest was held upon the bodies in each case. The Coroner examined a number of the prisoners, taking the precaution first to remove all the officers of the prison. The jury returned a verdict of natural death; and volunteered a written statement to this effect—"we cannot separate without expressing our satisfaction at the general treatment of the prisoners at this prison." And the value of this unsolicited testimony is the greater, as the Coroner, Mr. Wakley, declared that he had previously been prejudiced against the prison.

\* See *Prisons and Prisoners*, by Jos. Adshead, London, 1845.

The result of the scrutiny which this model institution has undergone has been to settle the question of its humanity, and in its place to raise another, viz.: Is the discipline sufficiently punitive? This question, however, is abundantly answered by the mere statistics of prison offences and punishments. At Pentonville the cases of prison delinquency were eleven and a half per cent. per annum; while at Coldbath Fields Prison, one of the best conducted prisons upon the silent and congregated system, they numbered within a fraction of one hundred and sixty-two per cent., showing the remarkable difference of one hundred and fifty per cent. in this significant item in the moral effect of imprisonment.

The effect of the experiment tried at London, has been decisive for England. In 1845 there were in process of erection prisons on the Pentonville model at not less than fifteen or twenty different places with an aggregate of twelve thousand cells; one of which, that at Liverpool, comprising no less than eleven hundred cells, is the largest in the United Kingdom.

In Prussia the controversy was waged about the same time and with perhaps still greater zeal in high quarters. Doctor Julius, who ranks high among the philanthropists of our age, was deputed by the King of Prussia to visit the United States, and spent three years among us studying our institutions and collecting information on the subject. The effect was, as in all the other cases, to convert him into a staunch, able, and leading advocate of the separate system. The King himself, while in England visited the Model Prison at Pentonville and minutely inspected its construction, arrangement, discipline, and effects both moral and sanitary. Such was the impression made upon his mind and feelings, that he declared upon the spot, "*My determination is now fixed:*" and it is hardly necessary to add that he has carried out that determination with intelligence, wisdom and perseverance. Five prisons of large size, were immediately erected by his order, in various parts of the kingdom.

Frederick William is not the only crowned head in Europe who has entered the controversial arena upon this interesting subject. The King of Sweden has studied and written largely and ably on the subject, and exerted his personal and official influence with great zeal in promoting the cause of prison discipline. Eight prisons, on the separate plan, have been built

under the joint auspices of the King and Diet of Sweden : and the Pennsylvania system may now be considered as completely nationalized in Sweden.

In Poland the reform began in 1829, and in 1835 a large separation-prison was opened at Warsaw, and since that period at least two others have been added. In Denmark there are eleven either finished or in course of erection. In Norway the principle has also been introduced and a large penitentiary has been constructed at Christiana, the capital of the country. In Belgium the same principle has prevailed. The celebrated *Maison de Force* at Ghent has been remodelled and a large prison at Liege erected on the separate plan: and a *projet de loi* was submitted to the House of Representatives by the Minister of Justice three years ago, which, if we remember rightly, was adopted, for introducing the separate system in the case of all the male adult convicts in the kingdom. In Switzerland, Holland, Hamburgh and several of the German Dutchies, the discussion has likewise terminated in the adoption of the Pennsylvania or separate system.

For the purpose of harmonizing, maturing, and propagating the views which had thus sprung up independently in different parts of Europe, a general Congress of those friends of humanity who were especially interested in the welfare of prisoners, assembled at Frankfort-on-the-Maine in September 1846. "It embraced seventy-five members, viz.: Germans, forty-six; Englishmen, six; Frenchmen, six; Swedes and Norwegians, six; Dutchmen, six; Swiss, two; and one each from Belgium, Denmark, Poland and the United States. Of professions, there were from Germany alone eight Judges or Presidents of tribunals; seven Professors of law at the Universities; six Governors or superintendents of prisons; five prison Chaplains; six Physicians; five advocates; four members of legislative bodies; and from other countries there were several chiefs of the administration and inspectors-general of prisons; Presidents and Secretaries of prison societies; prison Architects, and Editors of prison journals."

The great principles of the prevailing penitentiary systems were thoroughly discussed for three successive days, and the results of wide observation and mature experience over the civilized world were well considered, and carefully compared,



and at the close of their sessions a series of resolutions was passed, fully recognizing the *separation of all prisoners*, accused and convicted, on long or short sentences, as an *essential feature of the discipline*.\* And this decision was fully approved and confirmed by a second Congress called for the same purpose, which was held at Brussels, in the following year, and composed of representatives of sixteen different nations. With such a response rolling back upon them from Europe like the voice of many waters, it was no wonder that the doubts raised by their own common sense about the fairness and truth of the monstrous enormities charged against the Pennsylvania prison in the Boston Reports, should have grown into settled unbelief, on the part of many of the friends and even some of the members of the Boston Society itself. When the Report for the year 1845 was presented to the society, these doubts were boldly avowed and enforced by considerations which arrested its adoption, and procured the appointment of a committee to inquire into the matter, and if need be, inspect the Pennsylvania prisons in person, and incorporate the result of their inquiries with the forthcoming Report. This committee were constrained to adopt views so incompatible with the prevailing tenor of the Report, that the Board of Managers refused to publish the result. In 1846 a similar fate awaited the annual Report. "It was suspended by the side of its fellow;" and a second committee was appointed to take the whole matter in hand.

It so happened that just at this crisis a new city prison was to be built in Boston; and the new party in the Society, were bold enough to propose that it should be on the separate plan.

A very intelligent and highly respected citizen of Boston, George Sumner, Esq., who had been residing in Paris long enough to become possessed of the enlightened views, which the governments in common with the philanthropists of Europe had so unanimously adopted, addressed a letter to the Mayor of the city, putting him in possession of the views thus ascertained and settled, and expressing his surprise that any doubt should be entertained upon the subject at home. This letter contributed greatly to strengthen the hands of those who were striving to set right the public opinion formed by more than twenty years of

\* See *An Inquiry*, &c. pp. 151, 152.

uncontradicted misrepresentation. It was not to be expected, however, that an entire change could be effected so easily in a community which had grown up in its present belief, and which was committed to its opinions by heavy pecuniary forfeits, in addition to the mortification of recanting not only argument but abuse; and every one of whose public presses was under the dominant faith. That an opposing belief should have sprung up at all under these circumstances, was itself a powerful testimony to the truth. To clear that truth of the accumulated and hardened concretions of years of prejudice, and enthrone it in the convictions even of intelligent and candid men, must be the work of time. Accordingly when the society met in 1847, the suspended Annual Reports of the two preceding years, together with the reports of the select committees thereon, and the draft of the Annual Report for the year just closed, all came up for consideration. The discussion was very warm and was prolonged into a series of evening meetings, which attracted great attention, and finally terminated by the adoption of the last of the three Annual Reports;—that, namely, for 1847. Alarmed at the danger impending over their long cherished institutions, the surrounding organs lifted up one simultaneous howl, upon the same old key-note, against the cruelties of “solitary imprisonment.” The truth however has been lodged in the bosom of the intelligent and inquiring; and its fruits may already be clearly seen in the structure now rearing for that very prison, the determination of whose plan, precipitated the discussion we have described.

We have been thus minute and circumstantial in giving the history of this controversy, because we believe, with the old rhetoricians, that a clear and true narration is often the most conclusive argument. Such we think is the case in the present instance. If any one has had the patience to follow us through this brief, and yet we fear somewhat tedious, history of the discussions and proceedings relating to the subject of prison discipline, we can hardly conceive it possible that he should fail to be convinced in regard to the main point in the controversy. If this is a matter to be determined by adjudication at all, and if there is any such thing as conclusiveness in experience or human testimony, how can it be more conclusively settled than it has been?

The whole reformation in the treatment of prisoners, let it be

remembered, sprang from the conviction that something was due to the convicts, not merely on the score of common humanity, which was outraged before, but likewise with a view to their moral well-being. This latter object sub-divided itself into two distinct ends or stages:—first that which aimed to prevent the monstrous moral evils incident to the association of prisoners of all shades of character, and criminality. And secondly that which was instinct by the higher Christian idea, of attempting the moral reformation of convicts, and restoring them to society as better citizens, because educated into a knowledge and belief of the Christian law of morality, with its inward sense of obligation, and its outward and everlasting sanctions.

The adjudication between the congregate and separate systems can be made intelligently and justly, only in the view of both these objects. In applying the first as a test of their comparative merit, there can be no question that the presumption of superiority lies on the side of the Pennsylvania prisons. There is no possibility of corrupting association, because the separation is complete and constant. The inmates neither know each other's names, nor see each other's face, nor hear each other's voice. Their isolation is perfect.

On the other hand, the friends of the Auburn system argue, 1. That the same object is attained in the congregate prisons, by the rigid enforcement of silence, without resorting to the needless rigour of preventing all personal association. 2. They contend that to prevent all communication among prisoners, is impossible, and therefore it is useless to try. 3. They appeal to the *argumentum ad crumenam*; and cypher out a small balance against society, amounting at the Philadelphia Penitentiary to ten or fifteen dollars a year, for each prisoner. 4. Lastly and chiefly, they declaim against the cruelty and inhumanity of dooming men to solitude; and insist upon it that it is destructive to the body and the mind of the prisoner.

To all this the friends of the convict separation system reply substantially as follows:—1. In regard to the forced silence of congregate convicts they argue, in the first place, that it is far more tyrannical and grinding to the spirits to bring human beings together, and yet forbid them to speak, or exchange signals of recognition, under penalty of the lash, than to prevent communication by keeping them entirely and personally separate. Let any one

ask himself which would be the most tantalizing and tyrannical, and which would most stir his sullen anger, or provoke his efforts at resistance. The number and proportion of the punishments inflicted at all the congregate prisons abundantly show the truth and force of this consideration. It appears from the comparison of statistics on a large scale, that five times as many punishments have been inflicted in the congregate prisons for this single violation of the rules, as were found necessary among the same number of separate prisoners, for all offences whatsoever.

2. This stern regimen is not only galling but inoperative. The prisoners will manage to elude the closest vigilance. Congregated human beings cannot be prevented from communicating with each other.\* This is abundantly clear from the vast number of cases that are detected and punished. And of course these bear but a trifling proportion to the cases which are undetected. Desperate as the propensity to communicate with a fellow being at one's side must be, yet the poor convict would hardly venture the risk of the *cat*, or that more terrific instrument the *douche*, unless the numerical chances were greatly in favour of his escaping detection.

And besides, suppose the iron silence to reign unbroken under terror of the lash, and no word to be uttered during the live-long day, yet who is so ignorant of human nature as to suppose that men have no language for communicating character, feeling, or thought, but the conventional language of words. Nor do we refer merely to such obvious signs as may be prohibited equally with words. Who does not know that there are incessantly streaming from the mere presence of a human being, influences, sentiments and feelings, which are perfectly intelligible and perfectly efficient for moral purposes, without the intervention of any conventional language whatever. Who has not seen and felt this power in congregated masses of men, where not a word has been uttered. It really seems almost incredible, that wise men should build an argument even in an extremity, and much less a great scheme involving the moral and material well-being of countless thousands, upon so flimsy a foundation as this. Who would feel that the moral interests of his child

\* "Experience has shown the impossibility of keeping silence in society, and the certain effect of the law of silence is to encourage hypocrisy and teach fraud."  
—Third Report of the New York Prison Association, Second Part, p. 94.



were safe, especially if he had disclosed already a proclivity to vice, if he were shut up to labour day after day, surrounded and pressed upon by a gang of corrupt and hardened criminals, even admitting, what is impossible, that no word or look were interchanged. The supposition is absurd. Vice is too infectious to be kept from spreading by any such precaution. And finally, the mere knowledge of each other's person, acquired in the Auburn prison is itself decisive against the plan; because it enables the designing and unscrupulous villain to seduce into crime, or failing in that, to levy black mail without mercy, upon his well disposed prison acquaintances, when he happens to find them striving to re-establish among strangers, a character for virtue and integrity. The history of prisons and prisoners contains some recitals of this sort, that might move the pity of a fiend. In the Philadelphia Prison, and we presume in the separate prisons generally, the convicts are designated by their numbers and not their names, so that there may remain no trace of their criminal history to identify them in after life, in case they should be disposed to cover over that period of guilt and shame, by an honest and reputable career. 3. The most conclusive test of the comparative merit of the two systems, arises from their respective adaptations to the higher end of penitentiary discipline;—that, namely, which aims not merely to arrest, but to counteract the workings and transform the leaven of corruption. Which system furnishes the best facilities and holds out the strongest hope of sound and thorough reformation, based on true Christian principles? The answer to this question seems to be determined by these three considerations. In the first place the hope of repentance and reformation is conditioned upon the removal of every cause tending to support the guilty individual while bearing the burden of his punishment, or to blind his eyes to the enormity of his crime. Now every one must see at a glance how completely this condition is broken, by placing the culprit in a society composed exclusively of other criminals. No one can fail to observe the supporting power of mere companionship in guilt. We all know how easily the early kindlings of repentance can be quenched in the heart, by a cold unsympathising look, and how the first purposes of amendment can be scattered to the winds, by the leer of sarcasm or contempt, or by the sullen aspect of defiance, or hatred, or scorn.

These are influences which no rigours of silence can check, and from which nothing less than complete personal isolation can deliver the convict. It is like the virus of malignant contagion, propagated by mere contact, not only without the intervention of any verbal communication, but without even the necessity of any distinct intention. It is this consideration which satisfies us of the inexpediency of the device introduced in the Model Prison at Pentonville, for bringing the convicts together in the chapel of the institution for religious worship; notwithstanding the arrangements are such as to prevent the prisoners from seeing each other. The power of sympathy is undoubtedly a most potent instrument for the propagation of sentiment as well as feeling. In seeking to avail themselves of this instrument, so efficient in the worship of ordinary Christian congregations, the projectors of that institution seem to have forgotten that the sort of influence which it propagates depends upon the dominant sentiments of the assembly. So far, therefore, as it is of any effect at all,—and without some effect it would of course, not have been resorted to,—the effect cannot fail to be unfriendly to the end sought, just because an assembly of prisoners is always to be presumed to be predominantly vicious in character, if not in feeling. In accordance with these views, grounded on the obvious principles of human nature, we have been informed by the excellent Warden and Moral Instructor at the Philadelphia prison, that they constantly find individuals affected by the truths which penetrate their separate cells, in a way and to a degree, that would be obviously improbable, if not impossible, if the convicts were brought together even on the restricted plan of the Pentonville prison.

A second condition necessary to any reasonable hope of reforming prisoners, is that their instruction and treatment should be adapted to the peculiar circumstances and mental state of each individual. On the importance of this condition, it is needless to enlarge. Obvious as its application is, in the case of several hundreds of criminals, of all shades of character and training, it is equally obvious that its whole force falls into the scale of the separate system.

The third condition necessary to any complete and lasting reformation, and which seems decisive in the view before us, is that the incipient convictions and resolutions of the unhappy

convict should be fostered and encouraged most sacredly, by every possible means; and above all, that every hindrance should be taken out of his way, and that the hope of perfect recovery, and ultimate restoration to the confidence and respect of society, should be allowed to shine upon his darkness, and sweeten the bitter cup of his penal sorrows. How all this can be done, when he is daily mingling not only in the companionship of acknowledged and mostly hardened criminals, but exposed as a criminal himself, to the curious gaze of unthinking and unsympathising crowds,—branded publicly, and by name, as a convict, and liable any where and at any time to be recognized as such;—how such a discipline as this is compatible with any reasonable hope of regaining virtue and respectability, passes all our comprehension. To suppose it favourable to such a result, is too absurd to admit of argument.

2. In regard to the comparative expense of the two classes of prisons, we have but a word to say. The proceeds of labour in the Philadelphia Prison have always fallen short of the expenses of the establishment, by about twelve or fifteen dollars a year, for each prisoner. Some of the New York congregate prisons, we notice, have failed equally the last year to meet their expenses. On the other hand the State Prison at Trenton, New Jersey,—on the separate plan—has paid all its expenses, including some extraordinary outlays; and has a surplus to the credit of the state, amounting to upwards of four thousand dollars. Surely this should satisfy the most scrupulous economist, even if the moral interests of society are to be weighed against dollars and cents. We are not meaning, however, to deny, that the congregate system may be made the most lucrative to the state. But has it come to this, that the character of our great penal institutions, involving the temporal and eternal welfare of thousands of guilty human beings, and the security and peace of society, is to be determined by the amount of revenue, which can be wrung from the labours of the convicts?

Thus far we have found plain sailing. The case is almost too plain for argument. Now comes the real tug of war. What avails the greater security, the greater efficiency, the greater moral and reformatory power of the separation principle, when the mind sinks into idiotic fatuity, and the body finally succumbs under the intolerable and crushing night-mare of abso-



lute unbroken solitude! Here, as all the world knows is the great point of the onset. To this point, therefore, we must, in concluding, address our defence.

And in the first place, the whole argument is emasculated at once, by the simple remark, that there is no *solitude* in the case. There never was a more perfect example of a fallacy lying hid in a word. There is, as we have seen, but one single principle, which is essentially characteristic of the Pennsylvania system; viz, the separation of the convicts from each other, for the objects and the reasons already specified. As the only feasible method of attaining that end, the plan was adopted of building a separate prison for each convict. It is simply as if one of our best conducted county prisons contained but a single prisoner. This is the whole mystery, about which such a storm of controversy has been raised. The phantom that has been conjured up, of a lone human being, confined in a damp, dark cell, whose solitude is unbroken day after day, by a single human voice, or uncheered by a single ray of sun-light, or unenlivened by any motion or sound emanating from the outward world of activity or life, is as purely imaginary, as the horrible stories with which nurses used to frighten naughty children. The inmate of a Pennsylvania prison has plenty of light, breathes the sweet air of heaven, has an open yard to his cell, sufficient employment to occupy his thoughts, as many books as he can profitably use,—at least, and by necessity four or five visits every day from officers of the prison, with a chance of twice as many from official or friendly visitors, with whom he converses freely, besides stated and frequent interviews of considerable length, with the Moral Instructor and the School Master; is taught a useful trade, if he has none, and to read, and write, and cypher, if he does not know before; and to crown all, enjoys regular religious instruction, and divine worship every Sabbath, while perfectly secluded from all hardening and corrupting influences, and shielded from the spirit-breaking reflection of being an exposed, known, and recognized convict. It is no wonder that when men who have received their impressions from Boston, come to see the real facts of the case, their views of the nature and tendency of the system should undergo a complete and radical change.

In regard to the health of the prisoners whether of body or



mind, the friends of the system join issue with their opponents, and offer to try the cause either on the ground of its intrinsic principles and necessary tendencies, or by the competent opinions of the highest medical authorities, or by an appeal to the facts of the case, as they are in evidence before the world.

As this is really the only point which can be seriously brought into controversy, it may be worth while merely to say, that if experience should ultimately show, contrary to all apparent evidence at present, that the amount of society actually enjoyed in the Penitentiary at Philadelphia, or any other particular prison on the separate plan, is insufficient to sustain the spirits and mental vigour of the convicts, that amount may be increased indefinitely, without the least infringement of the principle; provided only, that the association be derived from any other quarter than the other convicts. It seems impossible, therefore, that the system should break down at this point, because there is no necessary limit to the amount of association from virtuous quarters; unless the extraordinary ground should be assumed, that the silent presence of other convicts, is the only and sure specific against the dangers of imprisonment, both to the body and the mind.

In regard to this point it should be borne in mind that some degree of injury, from confinement, and friction of temper, is unavoidable, in any mode of prison life. It is a necessary condition of its punishment. The health of a company of convicts cannot, therefore, be fairly expected to equal that of the same number of persons in respectable out-door occupation. The tendencies to an undue proportion of disease, both bodily and mental, among convicts, arise from the following causes. 1. Vitiating hereditary constitutions, so frequently existing among that class of persons from whom prisoners are generally taken. 2. Bad habits, irregularity, intemperance and exposure, incident to habits of vice before commitment. 3. Hence germs of disease partially developed, are very often found in prisoners at the time of their commitment. Of twenty-two deaths in one year at the Philadelphia prison, no less than sixteen were registered as diseased at their admission. And this has been about the usual proportion. 4. Bad and inadequate nutrition. To this cause Dr. Woodward, Physician during six years to the Connecticut State (congregate) prison, attributes mainly, the large

proportion of dyspeptic and tubercular diseases, terminating in marasmus and consumption in that prison.\* 5. Secret vice, which more than any other cause, tends to depress and exhaust the physical powers, and induce insanity and even fatuity of mind. 6. Change of life, from free exercise in the open air, to constant confinement in narrow limits, generally at sedentary, and sometimes dusty, employments. To see the effect of this item, it is only necessary to compare the sallow and unhealthy appearance of shoe-makers or weavers, in the close and dirty suburbs of a manufacturing town, with the full and ruddy form of butchers or drovers. 7. The depressing influence of moral causes, which invariably attend in crowds upon criminals, and especially when overtaken by the punishment of their transgressions.

It is obvious that all these causes of disease are entirely independent of any particular method of prison discipline. Accordingly the intelligent physician of the Auburn Prison, says, (Report for 1849, p. 128.) "From all the observation I have been able to make, I am satisfied that few men can bear imprisonment eight or ten years, without becoming both mentally and physically debilitated; and many middle aged men, when they leave the prison, appear to be broken down in mind and body." This is the testimony from a *congregate* prison; and confirms the conclusion to which we had come from an extensive and careful comparison of statistics, as well as from the very nature of the case, that the separate prisons, taken on a wide scale, are decidedly more favourable to the health of the prisoners, both mental and bodily, than the *congregate* prisons. In the case of the Eastern Penitentiary at Philadelphia, from which the unfavourable statistics have been invariably drawn, it should be remembered that its tables of disease, insanity and mortality, are fed by the most vitiated and wretched population any where to be found,—the miserable colored population of Southwark and Moyamensing. At the close of six years professional attendance, the first physician, Dr. Bache, says, "My reports clearly show that more than four-fifths of the mortality are to be charged to the presence of colored convicts:" although at no time did their numbers exceed one-third of the white prisoners.

\* See an Inquiry, p. 58.

Besides this character of the population, we think we observe a tone of decided dissatisfaction pervading the report of the present physician, Dr. Given, in regard to the hygienic arrangements of the prison, and having no connexion with the principle of separation. If this be so, it should command the instant attention of the proper authorities; for this prison, from its peculiar relation to the controversy, has filled, and deserves to fill, a large space in the eye of all who are interested in the question. It is certain that its sanitary statistics make a much less favourable exhibit than those of many, perhaps most, other prisons both in this country and in Europe on the separate principle. And although we regard the noble cause, for which humanity owes so much to the projectors and managers of this institution, as already safely established, and destined ultimately to a complete triumph throughout the civilized world, yet these gentlemen owe it to themselves and to their cause, to make their own institution as perfect as it is possible, under the circumstances, for an institution to be.

But as the vital question of the influence of the separate system upon the health and the minds of the prisoners, is, after all, a simple matter of fact, to be established like any other fact by experience and testimony, we close our remarks by citing a few of the authorities, on which we may rest the conviction of its safety and superiority; merely saying again, that for a skillful elimination of the sources of error in estimating the value of the testimony on both sides, and for a heaping up of evidence, almost to superfluity, from every quarter under heaven, not even excepting Boston itself, we must once more refer our readers, to the "Inquiry, &c.," by a citizen of Pennsylvania.

Dr. Jas. B. Coleman physician to the New Jersey State Prison at Trenton, says, "You will find by them (the monthly health reports) that but one death has occurred—and that a suicide. It is not necessary to mention again, in detail, what you already know, that the management of the prisoners is such as to ensure as great an amount of health and comfort as can be found amongst an equal body of men, under any circumstances. From diseases contracted in the prison, where there are under discipline two hundred and sixty persons, the deaths do not average one a year."—*Report of the New Jersey State Prison, Jan. 1849.*

Dr. Darrach, Physician to the Eastern Penitentiary of Penn-

sylvania, says, "I have no hesitation in saying, that the white mortality in the Eastern State Penitentiary is nearly, if not quite, as small as in the community at large, and the excess of mortality among the colored convicts, is not to be attributed to anything peculiar in the discipline of the institution, but to the depraved and degraded condition of this class of prisoners, who constitute only about one-third of the whole prison population, while they give two-thirds of the mortality.—*Tenth Report of the Eastern State Penitentiary*, p. 22. Quoted by a citizen of Pennsylvania, p. 62.

Dr. Hartshorne, successor to Dr. Darrach, says: "The percentage of mortality in five State prisons on the Auburn or congregate plan, derived from the ratio between the aggregate number of deaths and that of the prisoners within the year is 2.41. That of three penitentiaries conducted on the separate or Pennsylvania plan, is 2.11; which shows a percentage of three-tenths in favour of the latter, notwithstanding the miserable character of the low black and wretched white vagrants that are crowded upon us from the dens and purlieus of the city."—*Fifteenth Report of the Eastern State Prison*, p. 32, cited in the *Inquiry* p. 69.

Dr. De Balzac, Professor of the Royal College of Versailles, speaking of the separate prison for the Department of the Seine in France, says, "The sanitary condition of the cellular prison is incomparably better than that of the prisons in common. Experience has shown that the system (of separation) is favourable to the health of the prisoners, and that it has no deleterious influence on their intellect."—*Field on Prison Discipline*, cited in the *Inquiry*, p. 153.

The Physician of the separate prison at Montpellier, in France, says, "Out of six hundred and fifty-eight men, and one hundred and sixty-six women, received in the prison, three men and one woman have been put under treatment for mental derangement, but each one of these had shown signs of insanity before coming to the prison, and experience shows that the system of isolation, with its attendant visits, instead of increasing, has a tendency to moderate and quiet the predisposition to insanity." *Inquiry* p. 153.

M. Ardet, Honorary Inspector of the prisons of France says, "The most perfect unanimity is found in the observations of



the medical attendants of the separate prisons in France, some of whom have feared the effects of the discipline upon the health of prisoners. All acknowledge that sickness is found less frequently, and of shorter duration. Epidemic disorders, and sickness occasioned by the change of the seasons, rarely penetrate the cells, whilst under the old system the inhabitants of the prison never escaped. They frequently see prisoners weak, emaciated, and languishing, gradually recover all the outward signs of good health. Thus several physicians formally declare that the cellular system ought to be accepted as a benefit on account of health,"—[M. Ardet, Honorary Inspector of the prisons of France, at the Frankfort Congress, 1846.—Cited by Field, vol. ii. p. 363.]

The only remaining testimony we shall cite is that of the Count Gasparin, equally eminent as a Christian and a Statesman. "Every Government," says he in his letter to Mr. Sumner, "which in the actual state of society, and of the progress of Social science, adopts any other than the separate system, will expose itself to the necessity of having before long to reconstruct its prisons."

---

### ART. III.—*The Apostleship a Temporary Office.*

In a former number\* an attempt was made to prove that the highest permanent office in the church is that of Presbyter, by showing that the primitive Presbyters exercised the highest ministerial functions. In opposition to this doctrine, some allege the superiority and perpetuity of the Apostolic office. If this office was superior to that of Presbyter, and if it was designed to be perpetual, it follows of course that no church authority can rightfully be exercised, except by those who have succeeded the Apostles in the powers which belonged to them as such, and as distinguished from the Elders of the Church. Let it be observed, however, that in order to justify this conclusion, two things must be made out. If the Apostles were not an order of church officers, distinct from and superior to the Presbyters or Elders,

\* See p. 116 of this volume.

the strongest proof that the office was perpetual only proves that that of Elder was designed to be perpetual, which all admit. If, on the other hand, the Apostolic office was a temporary one, it matters not how far it may have been superior to that held by Presbyters, who still remain, in that case, the highest permanent office-bearers in the Christian Church. In order then to the decision of the controversy, two distinct questions are to be determined. 1. Were the Apostles superior to Presbyters? 2. Was their office, as distinct from that of Presbyter, designed to be perpetual? By some Presbyterian writers both these questions have been answered in the negative, while all Episcopalians, who assert the *jus divinum* of prelatical episcopacy, answer both affirmatively. In the remainder of the present argument the first point will be yielded to the adverse party; that is to say, it will be granted that the Apostles were church-officers superior to Presbyters or Elders. At the same time an attempt will be made to prove, exclusively from scripture, that the Apostolic office was a temporary one.

I. The first argument in favour of this proposition is that the continuance of the office is no where expressly stated.

To this it might be answered, that an office being once created, its continuance must be presumed, without an explicit declaration to the contrary.

The general principle is not denied; but in this case there are peculiar circumstances which afford strong ground for a contrary presumption.

1. The original Apostles are uniformly spoken of as constituting a distinct and well-defined body of men, not only in the gospel history, but in the latest books of the New Testament. "But, beloved, remember ye the words which were spoken before by THE APOSTLES OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST, how that they told you there should be mockers in the last time who should walk after their own ungodly lusts." (Jude, vi. 17, 18.) This mode of expression seems to intimate, that "the apostles" belonged to a preceding period, and that most of them were actually gone. Jude would hardly have expressed himself in this way, if the title had already been extended to a multitude of others. "Rejoice over her, thou heaven, and ye holy APOSTLES AND PROPHETS; for God hath avenged you on her." (Rev. xviii. 20.) Can there be any doubt that this apostrophe is ad-

dressed to the original Apostles? And would John have so described them if the name, in his day, had been rightfully assumed by many others, equal and equally "supreme" in power? That he was not familiar with any such extension of the name, may also be inferred from Rev. xxi. 14, where he speaks of "the twelve apostles."

It may be urged, however, that the case of Paul destroys the force of the presumption drawn from the mention of the Apostles as a limited number; for he was a thirteenth, and if one might be added, why not more?

This objection would be valid, but for one consideration, which converts the case of Paul into a strong corroboration of the doctrine against which it is alleged. That case is every where referred to and described as an anomalous exception. He speaks of himself as the least of the Apostles (1 Cor. xv. 9,) and not only as morally unworthy to be called one, but as almost too late to be an Apostle, as one born out of due time, (1 Cor. xv. 8,) while at the same time he asserts his equality with the rest as to official rank and power. Now if the Apostolic office was intended to be regularly continued, and if many others were to be brought into it, and invested with its "supreme powers," even during Paul's life-time, and by his agency, how was he like one born out of due time? Or how could he call himself the least of the Apostles? Can any degree of humility make it consistent with his truth and candour, to pronounce himself inferior, as an Apostle, to Timothy, Titus, Epaphroditus, Silas, Junias, and Andronicus, who were all officially his equals on the supposition which we are opposing? Since then the case of Paul is represented by himself as an anomaly, it serves, as a sole exception, to confirm the general statement that the Apostles are referred to as a limited body, not to be increased. This is the first ground of presumption that the office of apostle, as distinguished from all others, was intended to be temporary.

2. A second is, that some of the apostolic powers are acknowledged by both parties in this controversy to have been temporary. The presumption, therefore, is, that all the rest were temporary likewise, except so far as the continuance of any can be clearly shown from scripture. Now it is not and cannot be denied, that some of them were thus continued, and

that for this very purpose the offices of Presbyter and Deacon now exist. But this very fact adds greatly to the strength of the presumption, that the apostolic office was a temporary one. For if the cessation of some apostolic powers makes it *a priori* probable that all the rest ceased likewise, how much more does the acknowledged transfer of some of the remaining powers to distinct church-officers, continued in existence for that very purpose, make it *a priori* probable, that all the apostolic powers, which did not thus cease, were thus transferred.

3. The power exercised by the Apostles was a general ambulatory power, not confined to particular districts. This was exactly suited to the incipient condition of the church, but could not supersede the necessity of permanent and local officers, after the planting of particular churches. Now the elders and deacons, of whom we read in the New Testament, are the elders and deacons of particular churches, after whose appointment the irregular supervision of the Apostles might be expected to cease, as being no longer needed. On the hypothesis, that the Apostles were commissioned merely to plant the church in various countries, and ordain permanent officers who should exercise such of the apostolical powers as were necessary for the continued existence of the church, while all the others ceased;—on this hypothesis the course of things could hardly have been different from that which is recorded. This then affords a third ground of presumption that the supposition is coincident with fact.

4. A fourth ground is, that the apostolic functions which all admit to have been subsequently exercised by Presbyters, are precisely those which, in their own nature, are the most important, viz. the preaching of the gospel and the administration of the sacraments. However important the powers of ordination and discipline may be, they derive their importance from the others. The end of discipline is to preserve purity and exclude the unworthy from the peculiar privileges of the church. The end of ordination is to secure a valid administration of the word and sacraments. If the Head of the Church had left this ministration to any one who chose to perform it, without special ordination to an office, whatever inconveniences might have attended that arrangement, it could not have impaired the intrinsic value of the word and sacraments. But if, on the other hand, there were no word and sacraments, ordination



would be useless. And the same may be said, *mutatis mutandis*, of government or discipline. These then (ordination and discipline) are subsidiary functions which derive their value from the relation they sustain to others. Now if the office of a Christian Presbyter had been invested with powers of a subordinate nature, i. e., such as derive their value from their being necessary to the exercise of others, it might have been alleged, with some degree of plausibility, that the Apostolic office was designed to be perpetual for the sake of those functions which were not bestowed on Presbyters, but which were essential to the being of the Church. But when we find that the lower office was invested with those powers which possess a necessary and intrinsic value, this, to say the least, adds strength to the presumption that the Apostolic office, which was thus succeeded by another order, in its most important functions, was intended to be temporary.

5. On the supposition, that some apostolic powers were neither shared by Presbyters nor discontinued, there is no means of determining what these reserved powers were. For if it be said that all which were not extended to Presbyters were thus reserved, this, in the first place, presupposes the decision of the question whether Presbyters ordained and governed; and, in the next place, supposing that they did not, the successors of the Apostles must, according to this rule, possess the power of working miracles, which certainly belonged to the original apostles. If it be said that this was a temporary gift of an extraordinary nature, then the power of bestowing the Holy Ghost was also temporary. But this our opponents are unwilling to admit. There is, in fact, no unity among Episcopalians, as to the precise powers which have been continued in their Bishops as successors of the Apostles. Some confine their claims to ordination. Some add discipline, as rightfully belonging only to the Bishop. Others add the power of bestowing the Holy Ghost. This last is inseparable from the gift of miracles. Whenever the effects of the gift of the Holy Ghost, conferred by the Apostles, are described, they are of a miraculous nature. The power of bestowing the more inward and spiritual influences of the Holy Ghost, is not only never claimed, but is expressly disclaimed. The Church of Rome is therefore more consistent than the advocates of High Church Episcopacy,

in claiming not only the power of conferring the Holy Ghost, but also its inseparable adjunct, that of working miracles. Our present design, however, is not to disprove the possession of this power, but to show the want of harmony among those who maintain that certain apostolic powers are continued in the church, by means of ministers distinct from and superior to Presbyters. And the design of showing this is to illustrate the impossibility of drawing any line between the powers which ceased or were transferred to Presbyters, and those which are alleged to have been continued in the apostolic office. And the use which we propose to make of this impossibility is simply to strengthen the presumption which has been already raised in favour of the doctrine that the Apostolic office, as distinct from that of Elder, and superior to it, was a temporary one.

The grounds of the presumption, then, are (1) that the twelve apostles are referred to in the New Testament, as a well-known body of men, limited in number, and not to be increased, except in the extraordinary case of Paul, which he himself describes as a remarkable exception—(2) that some of the powers exercised by the original apostles are no longer in existence—(3) that some which still exist are exercised by Presbyters, and were so exercised in apostolic times—(4) that those which are thus exercised by Presbyters are in themselves the most essential to the existence of the church—(5) that the office of Presbyter has been continued in the church for the very purpose of succeeding the apostles in these functions, and with a view to permanent action within fixed local bounds—(6) that the advocates for the perpetuity of the apostolic office are not agreed among themselves as to the powers which now belong to it, and that this want of agreement arises from the silence of scripture, and the impossibility of fixing any principle, by which a line may be drawn between the powers which are thus continued and those which have ceased or been transferred to Presbyters.

Waving the positive conclusions which might not unreasonably be deduced from these premises, we shall merely insist upon their furnishing a strong presumption, that the apostolic office was intended to be temporary, bearing the same relation to the permanent ministry that a constituent assembly or convention bears to the legislative body which succeeds it. We say there is

presumptive proof of this, so strong that it can only be counter-  
 vailed by positive evidence from scripture. The facts, which  
 have been stated as the grounds of this presumption, may be clearly  
 proved from scripture. It is not too much to ask, then, that if  
 another fact is to be added to the list, viz. that some of the  
 apostolic powers were neither discontinued nor transferred to  
 Presbyters and that for the exercise of these reserved powers  
 the apostolic office was itself continued, some explicit declaration  
 of the fact may be adduced to countervail the strong  
 adverse presumption. And this brings us back to our first position,  
 that THE CONTINUANCE OF THE APOSTOLIC OFFICE, IN ADDITION  
 TO THOSE WHICH BELIEVED IT OF ITS MOST IMPORTANT FUNCTIONS,  
 IS NO WHERE EXPLICITLY ASSERTED IN THE SCRIPTURES. As the  
 presumptions are so strong against the supposition of a permanent  
 apostleship, the very silence of the scriptures might be urged as a  
 decisive proof. It cannot be denied, however, that the force of this  
 negative argument would be destroyed by proving that the scriptures  
*indirectly* recognize the Apostolic office as perpetual. This leads  
 us to another view of the subject.

II. A second argument in favour of the proposition, that the  
 Apostolic office was a temporary one, is that the name Apostle, in  
 its strict and proper sense, is not applied, in the New Testament,  
 to any persons who were not of the original thirteen.

The passages, in which such an application of the title is alleged,  
 are the following. 1. "But the multitude of the city was divided  
 and part held with the Jews, and part with THE APOSTLES," [meaning  
 Paul and Barnabas]—"which when THE APOSTLES, Barnabas and Paul,  
 heard of, they rent their clothes," &c. (Acts xiv. 4, 14.)—2. "Salute  
 Andronicus and Junia, my kinsmen and my fellow-prisoners, who  
 are of note among THE APOSTLES, who also were in Christ before me"  
 (Rom. xvi. 7.)—3. "Yet I supposed it necessary to send to you  
 Epaphroditus, my brother and companion in labour and fellow-soldier,  
 but your messenger (*ἀπόστολον*), and he that ministers to my wants."  
 (Phil. ii. 25.)—4. "Whether any do inquire of Titus, he is my partner  
 and fellow-helper concerning you; or our brethren be inquired of,  
 they are the messengers (*ἀπόστολοι*) of the churches, and the glory  
 of Christ." (2 Cor. viii. 23.)—5. "Paul and Silvanus and



Timotheus unto the church of the Thessalonians" (1 Thess. i. 1,) compared with "Nor of men sought we glory, neither of you, nor yet of others, when we might have been burdensome AS THE APOSTLES of Christ," (1 Thess. ii. 6.)—From these texts it is inferred by some that Barnabus, Andronicus, Junias, Epaphroditus, Silas, Timothy, and certain brethren who accompanied Titus to Corinth, were Apostles, in the same sense in which Paul was an Apostle; and from this the obvious conclusion has been drawn, that the Apostolic office was intended to be permanent.

It might well be made a question whether the strong antecedent probability that the Apostolic office was a temporary one, could be wholly set aside by the application of the title in five places, however clear the application might be, and however obvious the sense in which the word was used. The advocates of this interpretation themselves protest against all objections to their system which are founded on the scriptural use of the word *Bishop*, which they own to be convertible with *Presbyter*. They have no right, therefore, to make that of the word *Apostle* the foundation of a perfectly exclusive system. If the *lawfulness* of a superior order were the point in question, incidental proofs of this kind ought to have due weight; but when attempts are made to prove, that the continuance of the Apostolic order, as distinct from that of Presbyters, is essential to the being of a church, and that in the face of such presumptions to the contrary as have been stated, a sober reasoner would have good cause to hesitate before receiving, as conclusive evidence, the application of the name in a few cases, even if the proposed interpretation of the passages referred to were undoubtedly correct.

But this is very far from being certain. Of the five texts cited, there are two, in which the very application of the title is at least very doubtful. 1. In the first epistle to the Thessalonians, the word ἀπόστολοι is not in juxtaposition or apparent connexion with the names of Timothy and Silas, but separated from them by fourteen intervening verses. It is not even alleged, that the joining of other names with Paul's, in the beginning of a letter, makes it necessary to refer the whole of its contents to all the persons thus included in title; because, after such a joint address, he often uses the first person singular. Nor is it, on the other hand, alleged, that the use of the plural *we* re-



quires such a reference; because that mode of speech is so habitual with Paul, that it may almost be regarded as one of his characteristic idioms; and, as if to guard against such a construction, he says, near the conclusion of this very passage, "Wherefore we would have come unto you, **EVEN I PAUL**, once and again." (1 Thess. ii. 18.) This explanation is, at least, sufficient to outweigh the argument derived from the plural form *ἀπόστολοι*, which is, no doubt, strictly, inapplicable to a single person, but not when preceded, as in this case, by a particle denoting resemblance or comparison. Though Paul could not call himself "the **APOSTLES** of Christ," he could assert his right to do a thing "as the apostles of Christ." He could disclaim having sought glory of them or of others, when he might have been burdensome as the apostles of Christ collectively had a right to be. This construction of the sentence is, to say the least, as natural as that which makes the plural form in chap. ii. 6, refer to Timothy and Silas, who are mentioned only in the title (i. 1,) and neither there nor elsewhere as apostles.

But even granting that this is a more probable explanation of the plural form, which is a mere gratuitous concession, it would not follow necessarily that Timothy and Titus were Apostles in the sense contended for; because another supposition is still open to us, namely, that *ἀπόστολοι* is here used in another sense. For which is it easier to believe, that Silas and Timothy were as much Apostles as Paul himself, but nowhere called so except here by implication and remote allusion—or that when he calls them by that title, he uses it in a wider sense, than when it is employed to designate our Lord's immediate followers? We are willing that this question should be answered without any reference to the reasons, hereafter to be stated, for believing that the word *apostle* is employed in a plurality of meanings. Even if there were no other reason for attaching to it a double sense, this case would be just as good a reason for supposing one, as it is for supposing Silas to have been an Apostle, in the absence of all proof from any other quarter. The one argument is this: Paul says, "we the apostles of Christ," and as Silas and Timothy are mentioned with him in the title of the epistle, they must be included; they were therefore Apostles, in the same sense in which Paul was one. The

other argument is this: The Apostles were a limited number, and Paul elsewhere speaks of his addition to it as an extraordinary thing; but Silas and Timothy, though often mentioned, are no where else called Apostles; therefore, when Paul so calls them, he uses the title in a wider sense. If these two arguments be only *equal* in conclusive force, they balance one another, and the passage cannot be employed as proof, that these two persons were "supreme Apostles." This is the case be it observed, on the supposition that the ἀπόστολοι in ch. ii. 6, refers to all the men named in ch. i. 1. But we have already seen that this reference is doubtful and that a different construction is, at least, as plausible. The adverse argument, then, rests on two assumptions; (1) that ἀπόστολοι in ch. ii. 6 refers to Timothy and Silas, as well as Paul; (2) that it must be taken in its strict and highest sense; whereas it is at least as probable that it does not refer to them, and that if it does it does not denote Apostles in the strict sense. To say the least, then, after every concession, this passage is too doubtful to be made the basis of an argument to prove, in opposition to such strong presumptions, that the office of Apostle was continued.

2. The other case, in which there is a doubt as to the application of the name APOSTLE, is Rom. xvi. 7. Here the phrase ἐπισημοὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις may mean either *eminent apostles* or *highly esteemed among* (i. e. by) *the apostles*. Admitting, for the sake of argument that the former is the better construction, we are not shut up to the conclusion that Andronicus and Junias (or Junia, as Bishop Onderdonk writes it, even while claiming him or her as an apostle) were Apostles in the strict sense. We have just as much reason to believe, that they were Apostles in another sense. Even supposing, for the present, that no such sense of the term can be proved from usage, we have just as much reason to infer it from this passage, as to infer that these two persons were Apostles in the strict sense. For against this inference lies, first, the whole weight of the strong presumption that the apostolic office was a temporary one; and, secondly, the extreme improbability that two eminent apostles, in the strict sense of that title, would be thus named among a crowd of private Christians, and never heard of elsewhere. Is it easier to believe this than that the word apostle has a double meaning, even supposing this to be incapable of proof from any other

quarter? We are not now determining the true sense of the passage. We are only showing that a passage which admits, first of two grammatical constructions, and then (assuming that contended for by our opponents) of two interpretations, cannot be regarded as decisive of so difficult and grave a question as the one respecting the perpetual or temporary nature of the apostolic office.

In these two cases, it is doubtful to whom the name Apostle is applied; but in the other three there can be no such doubt. We admit that Barnabas, Epaphroditus, and the brethren who accompanied Titus, are expressly called ἀπόστολοι; and from this the inference is drawn by our opponents, that the Apostolic office, strictly so called, was conferred upon these persons, and that it consequently did not cease with the original incumbents. This inference involves the assumption that the term ἀπόστολος has always the same meaning, viz., that of Apostle in the strict sense, as denoting one of the original thirteen, or a person equal to them in official rank and power, as supreme ruler of the church under Christ himself. In order to estimate the probability of this assumption, it is necessary to refer to the analogy of other terms, used to denote office in the Christian church.

The other terms admitted, upon both sides, to be so employed are πρεσβύτερος, ἐπίσκοπος, διάκονος, ποιμήν, διδάσκαλος, προφήτης, ἄγγελος. Now let it be observed that, of these seven words, not one was invented for the purpose, or derived from the Hebrew. They are all pure Greek words, used by profane writers, and already familiar to the Jews who spoke that language, before they were appropriated to the use in question. From this state of the case it would be natural and reasonable a priori, to conclude that all the words would have, at least, a double sense, as used in the New Testament, viz. a wide or popular meaning, according to their etymology and previous usage, and a stricter technical meaning, as appropriated to the designation of ecclesiastical office. How far this natural presumption is confirmed by the actual usage of the New Testament, may be forcibly stated, as to some of these terms, in the words of a well known episcopal writer.

“Many words have both a loose and a specific meaning.

\* Εὐαγγελιστής is omitted, because its precise meaning is a matter of dispute. As to the rest, there is a formal agreement.

The word 'angel' is often applied loosely, (Acts xii. 15. Rev. i. 20, ix. 14), but distinctively it means certain created spirits. The word 'God' is applied to angels, (Deut. x. 17. Ps. xcvi. 7, cxxxvi. 2), and idols, (Ex. xx. 3, xxiii. 24, &c.) and human personages or magistrates, (Exod. vii. 1, xxii. 28. Ps. lxxxii. 1, 6, cxxxviii. 1. John x. 35); but distinctively it means the Supreme Being. The word 'deacon' means an ordinary servant, a servant of God in secular affairs, and any minister of Christ; but a Christian minister of the lower grade is its specific meaning. So with the word 'elder'; it is sometimes applied to the clergy of any grade or grades; but its appropriate application is to ministers of the second or middle order. The above remarks, it is hoped, will enable those who feel an interest in consulting scripture on the subject before us, to do so without any embarrassment from the apparent confusion of official names or titles." *Episcopacy Examined and Re-examined*, p. 14.

"We would also advert to the fact that, however distinct may have been the three above latin names for the three grades of sacerdotal office, those names of office were, in the Greek, and at an earlier period, applied but loosely. At least, they were so in the New Testament. Thus we read 'this ministry [*deaconship*] and *apostleship* (Acts i. 25)' for the office to which Matthias was admitted. 'I am the apostle of the gentiles, I magnify mine office [my *deaconship*], the ministry [*deaconship*] which I have received,' 'approving ourselves the ministers [*deacons*] of God,' (Rom. xi. 13; Acts xx. 342; Cor. vi. 4), are passages applied by St. Paul to himself. We also read, 'who then is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers, [*deacons*] by whom ye believed?' (1 Cor. iii. 5), and 'do the work of an *evangelist*, make full proof of thy ministry, [*deaconship*]—thou shalt be a good minister [*deacon*] of Jesus Christ,' are admonitions addressed to Timothy, (2 Tim. iv. 5; 1 Tim. iv. 6.)" *ib.* p. 20. "It may not be improper to add some further illustrations of the uncertainty of official names. Thus we say the Jewish 'priesthood,' including in that term, with the priests, the superior order of high priests, and the inferior one of levites. Thus also we have the phrase 'ministry [literally *deaconship*] of reconciliation'; and the expressions, 'that the ministry [*deaconship*] be not blamed;' 'seeing we have this ministry, [*deacon-*



*ship*], 'putting me into the ministry, [*deaconship*],' and more especially 'apostles, prophets, evangelists, &c.,' are all said to have been given for the work of the ministry, [*deaconship*], (2 Cor. v. 18, vi. 3, iv. 1.; 1 Tim. i. 12; Eph. iv. 11, 12,) in all which passages the word *deaconship*, διακονία, the appellation strictly of a sacred body of men, or of their office, includes, nay, signifies chiefly, those who were superior to deacons. The word 'presbytery,' therefore, being no more definite than 'ministry' or 'deaconship,' cannot explain itself in favour of our opponents." *ib.* p. 21. "The mere expression *presbytery*, therefore, does not explain itself, and cannot of itself be adduced in favour of parity." *ib.* p. 21.

We make these quotations from an argument against the doctrine which we are defending, not for the sake of the specific application which the author makes of an important principle, but for the sake of the principle itself, which is, that names of office "do not explain themselves," and "cannot of themselves be adduced in favour" of either side of the question. An obvious deduction from this rule is that the mere use of the name "apostle" can prove nothing as to the precise rank of the men to whom it is applied, which can only be determined by a careful collation of the general usage with the context in any given case. Let us proceed to this comparison; but first let us consider the analogous usage of the other titles which have been enumerated, and which are employed to designate ecclesiastical office. In order to secure a satisfactory result, we shall survey them *seriatim*.

1. Πρεσβύτερος sometimes means *older*, as an adjective in the comparative degree, (Luke xv. 25; John viii. 9); sometimes an *old man* in the proper sense (1 Tim. v. 1, where it is put in opposition to πρεσβύτερα); sometimes an officer or magistrate under the Jewish commonwealth, (Matt. xxi. 23; Mark xv. 1; Luke vii. 3. Acts iv. 8, &c.); sometimes an officer of the Christian Church, (Acts xv. 2, xx. 17; 1 Tim. v. 19.; Tit. i. 5; Jas. v. 14; 1 Pet. v. 5.)

Επίσκοπος (which only occurs five times in the New Testament) in one case is applied to the Lord Jesus Christ as the Head of the Church, or the spiritual guardian of the souls of all believers, (1 Peter ii. 25). Elsewhere it denotes the official

overseer of a particular church or congregation, (Acts xx. 28; Phil. i. 1; 1 Tim. iii. 2; Tit. i. 7.)

3. Διάκονος sometimes means a menial servant, a domestic, (Matt. xx. 26, xxii. 13, xxiii. 11; John ii. 5, 9); sometimes a minister or agent either of good or evil, (Gal. ii. 17; 2 Cor. xi. 15); sometimes a secular representative of God, (Rom. xiii. 4); sometimes a minister of the old dispensation (Rom. xv. 8); sometimes a minister of the Christian Church generally, without regard to rank, (2 Cor. iii. 6, xi. 23; Eph. iii. 7, vi. 21; Col. i. 7, 23, 25, iv. 7; 1 Thes. iii. 2; 1 Tim. iv. 6); sometimes a *deacon*, the lowest order of church-officers. (1 Tim. iii. 8, 12.)

4. Ποιμήν sometimes means a literal shepherd, (Matt. xxv. 32. Luke ii. 8, 15, 18, 20); sometimes a spiritual pastor, both in reference to Christ himself, (Matt. xxvi. 31; John x. 2, 11, 12, 14, 16; Heb. xiii. 20; 1 Pet. ii. 25), and to his ministers, (Eph. iv. 11.)

5. Διδάσκαλος sometimes means a teacher generally, as opposed to a learner or disciple, (Matt. x. 25; Rom. ii. 20); sometimes a public teacher of religion, (Luke ii. 46; John iii. 2; Heb. v. 12; James iii. 1), especially the founder of a school or sect, (Matt. ix. 11, vii. 24; Luke xviii. 18); sometimes an official teacher in the Christian Church, (Acts xiii. 1; 1 Cor. xii. 28, 29; Eph. iv. 11; 1 Tim. ii. 7; 2 Tim. i. 11, iv. 3.)

6. Προφήτης once means a poet, regarded by the heathen as inspired, (Tit. i. 12.) Elsewhere it means, sometimes a prophet of the old dispensation, (Matt. i. 22, viii. 17, &c.), sometimes an inspired teacher in the Christian Church, (Acts xiii. 1; 1 Cor. xii. 28, 29, xiv. 29, 32, 37; Eph. iv. 11.)

7. Ἀγγελος sometimes means a human messenger, (Luke ix. 52); sometimes a spirit, good (Matt. i. 20, &c.) or bad, (Matt. xxv. 41; 2 Cor. xii. 7); sometimes an ecclesiastical superior (Rev. i. 20, ii. 1, 8, 12, 18, iii. 1, 5, 7, 14.)

Now if ἀπόστολος has one invariable meaning in the New Testament, it is contrary, not only to what might have been expected from the origin and previous usage of the term, but also to the analogy of the other terms used in the New Testament, to designate ecclesiastical office. The only probable supposition *a priori* is, that it would have the same variety of meaning as the rest. Now of the seven terms, which we have been considering, the three which occur most frequently in application

to ecclesiastical office, have a threefold usage perfectly distinguishable. They are all used in a popular sense, in a general religious sense, and in a specific ecclesiastical sense. Thus *πρεσβύτερος* is used, in a popular sense, to signify an old man; in a general religious sense, to signify a minister of any rank; and in a strict ecclesiastical sense to signify a Presbyter. The popular sense of *διάκονος* is a servant, its more restricted sense a minister, its most restricted sense a deacon. The widest sense of *διδάσκαλος* is a teacher of any kind; its more restricted sense a religious teacher; its most restricted sense, an authorized official teacher in the Christian Church. The three corresponding senses of the word *ἀπόστολος* would be (1) a messenger of any kind; (2) a religious messenger or missionary; (3) an Apostle, in the strict official sense before described. And this distinction, suggested by analogy, is verified by usage. The first of these senses occurs in John xiii. 16, "the servant is not greater than his lord, neither he that is sent (*ἀπόστολος*) greater than he that sent him." Here *ἀπόστολος* stands in the same relation to the *sender*, as the *servant* to the *lord*. The second sense occurs in Rom. xi. 13, where *ἐθνῶν ἀπόστολος* means not merely a Christian teacher of the highest rank, but one *sent out* as a missionary to the heathen. The same idea is still more clearly expressed in 1 Tim. ii. 7, where the collocation of the words connects *ἀπόστολος*, in a peculiar manner, with *κέρυξ* and *διδάσκαλος ἐθνῶν*. The very same form of speech is repeated in 2 Tim. i. 11. In neither of these cases would the word *bishop*, in the modern sense, seem natural in such a position. If *ἀπόστολος* is here used in the technical sense, without any special reference to its etymology, why is it thus twice placed between the titles *preacher* and *teacher of the Gentiles*? We are of course, not endeavouring to show, that Paul was not an Apostle in the strict sense, but that the word is sometimes used with special reference to its etymology, and in its secondary sense of a religious messenger or missionary. The third or strict sense is the usual one, and need not be exemplified.

Let us now apply this usage of the term to the three cases which remain to be considered. 1. It appears from Phil. iv. 10—18, that the Philippian Christians had sent a present to Paul at Rome, by the hands of Epaphroditus. For this act of benevolence the apostle heartily commends and thanks them in

the passage just referred to. It is a certain fact, then, that Epaphroditus was a *messenger* from them to Paul, for the specific purpose of supplying his necessities. When, therefore, in a former part of the same letter, Epaphroditus is described in these terms, "Epaphroditus, my companion in labour and fellow soldier but your ἀπόστολος," which is more probable, that it means an Apostle in the strict sense, or a messenger? The solution of this question is made still more easy by the words which are added—"and he that ministered to my want"—which are clearly explanatory of τὸν ἀπόστολον ὑμῶν. This interpretation of ἀπόστολος not only deducts one from the alleged proofs of an addition to the number of apostles, but adds one to the proofs that ἀπόστολος is sometimes used in the sense of messenger.

2. It appears from 2 Cor. viii. 16, 17, that Titus, in compliance with Paul's request, and his own strong inclination, was about to visit Corinth, and that Paul sent with him "the brother whose praise was in the gospel throughout all the churches," and also another "brother, whom (says he) we have oftentimes proved diligent in many things, but now much more diligent upon the great confidence which I have in you." Of these two persons who accompanied Titus, one is expressly said to have been "chosen of the churches to travel with us [i. e. Paul], with this grace which is administered by us, to the glory of the same Lord and declaration of your ready mind." He was therefore a messenger of the churches, and both he and the other companion of Titus were messengers of Paul to the church at Corinth; and the other would even seem, from the last clause of v. 22, to have been a messenger from that church to Paul. These facts afford sufficient data for the decision of the question as to the sense of the word ἀπόστολοι in the following sentence. "Whether any do inquire of Titus, he is my partner and fellow-helper concerning you; or our brethren be inquired of, they are the ἀπόστολοι of the churches, and the glory of Christ." (2 Cor. viii. 23.) Here are two cases, then, in which the word is applied to persons, who are not known to have been Bishops, but who are known to have been messengers, and are so described in the context. This prepares us for the only remaining case, that of Barnabas.

3. Acts xiv. 4, 14. In order to understand this case aright, it is necessary to bear in mind the nature of the work, in which



Paul and Barnabas were then engaged. This we shall state in the words of a favourite episcopal writer. "That this transaction at Antioch [Acts xiii. 1] related only to a special missionary 'work,' will be found sufficiently clear by those who will trace Paul and Barnabas through that work, from Acts xiii. 4 to xiv. 26; where its completion is recorded—"and thence sailed to Antioch from whence they had been recommended to the grace of God for the *work* which they fulfilled." This 'work,' their missionary tour, being 'fulfilled,' all was fulfilled that had been required by the Holy Ghost, when he had them 'separated' or 'recommended to the grace of God' 'for the work to which he had called them.' This call, therefore, this separation, this 'work,' related only to a particular mission. And this laying on of hands was no ordination, but a lesser ceremony, which has no bearing on the controversy between parity and episcopacy.\* "When the latter [i. e. Barnabas] had been made an Apostle, we know not; neither do we know when James the brother of the Lord, Sylvanus, &c., were admitted to that office."†

The case then stands thus: two men are called ἀπόστολοι, one of whom we know to have been an Apostle in the highest sense; but when the other "had been made an Apostle, we know not." From this application of the term our opponents infer that both were Apostles in the strict sense. To this we might reply that Barnabas is here called an Apostle in the strict sense, or rather included in the term ἀπόστολοι, for he is never so called separately, although often mentioned, and several times described, (Acts iv. 36; ix. 27; xi. 24; xiii. 1; xv. 35;) merely because he was Paul's colleague in this work, just as Silas is included in the description "Roman citizens," (Acts xvi. 37, 38,) for no reason that appears but this connexion with Paul, who is expressly and repeatedly declared to have been a Roman citizen, (Acts xxii. 25, 26, 27, 29; xxiii. 27.) Even granting, therefore, that ἀπόστολος is here used in its strict sense, it is by no means certain that it could have been applied, in that sense, to Barnabas alone; the rather as we have found no other case, in which it is so applied, either to him or any other person not of the original thirteen.

So too on the other hand, even admitting that he is individually styled an ἀπόστολος, it does not follow that he is so styled in the

\* *Episcopacy Examined and Re-examined*, p. 17.

† *Ib.* p. 18.

strict sense of the term. The word, as we have seen, is used in three distinct senses—(1) a messenger of any kind—(2) a religious messenger or missionary—(3) an Apostle in the strict sense. The name is here applied to a man who is no where else called an apostle, or described as one, but who was, at the very time referred to, engaged with Paul in “a special missionary work,” a “missionary tour,” to which the Holy Ghost had called them; for “this call, this separation, this work, related only to a particular mission.” Under these circumstances, which is more probable, that ἀπόστολος, as thus used, means a *missionary*, or that it means a supreme ruler of the church, equal in rank to the original thirteen? If it means the latter, it is singular, to say the least, that Barnabas, who is so often mentioned and repeatedly described, is no where else called an Apostle, which, in the case supposed, was his grand distinction. But if, on the other hand, he is so called in the lower sense, it is easy to explain why he is no where else so called, viz. because his apostolic character was temporary. “This work, this missionary tour, being fulfilled, all was fulfilled that had been required by the Holy Ghost, when he had them separated or recommended to the grace of God, for the work to which he had called them. This call, this separation, this work, related only to a particular mission.” True, he afterwards went out upon a similar mission, but not, as it would seem, under church authority, nor is the narrative of that mission upon record. Paul, on the contrary, was still an Apostle, and is still so called, which makes it at least probable that he was an Apostle in a higher sense than Barnabas.

Still it may be argued that as both are called Apostles, and as Paul was certainly one in the highest sense, the inference is plain that Barnabas was also an Apostle in the highest sense. This would be valid reasoning if it were not equally certain that Paul was an Apostle in the lower sense too. One of the senses of the word applies to both; another applies certainly to one of them. Which is more reasonable, to infer that the latter applied also to the other, or to infer that the former is the sense here intended? In the one case, this solitary passage is adduced to prove what is no where else recorded, viz. that Barnabas was strictly an Apostle. In the other case, nothing is assumed or supposed to be here proved, but what is clearly

revealed elsewhere, viz. that both Barnabas and Paul were missionaries.

The argument admits of a familiar illustration. In the foreign missions of our own and other churches, the word "missionary" has a double sense; a strict one applicable only to ordained ministers or clergymen, and a wider one including lay-assistants. The first is considered the most proper and is certainly the most usual sense; but the other does undoubtedly occur, even in the official documents of missionary boards, especially when several or all of those engaged in the work are spoken of collectively. Let us suppose then that in a certain mission, two persons, A and B, have long been labouring, the first as a preacher, and the second as a lay-assistant; but that in some one report or journal, they are twice mentioned by the common name of *missionaries*, and it becomes a question with some readers of the document, whether B was not an ordained minister. On examining the series of reports and journals, it is found that B is no where else even called a missionary, and that in the case in question, no act is ascribed to him which necessarily implies that he is an ordained clergyman. From these premises two opposite inferences are drawn. The one is, that as A is certainly a clergyman and as both are called missionaries, B must be a clergyman also. The other is, that as B is no where else represented as a clergyman, and as both he and A are certainly missionaries in a wider sense, that is the sense in which the term is used. Without insisting on a choice between these opposite deductions, as entirely conclusive, we may ask what would be thought of an argument to prove a doubtful point, as to the organization of the mission, from the mere application of the term in such a case. But in the case of Barnabas there is this distinctive circumstance, that the antecedent probability is in favour of the supposition, that the apostolic office, in the strict sense, was confined to a certain number of persons, among whom Barnabas was not; and that this presumption can only be removed by positive proof that he was an Apostle.

The amount, then, of the argument from names is this, that of five cases, in which the name apostle is said to be applied to persons not of the original thirteen, there are two in which the application is itself disputed, and at least so far doubtful as to

render them unfit to be relied on as proofs; while in these cases, and in all the rest, the word either requires or admits another sense than that of an Apostle proper. These cases, therefore, make no change in the truth of the general proposition, that the extension of the Apostolic office to persons not of the original thirteen, is no where taught in scripture, either directly, by explicit assertion of the fact, or indirectly, by the application of the name Apostle, in its strict and highest sense.

III. A third argument in favour of the proposition, that the Apostolic office was a temporary one, is that the qualifications for the Apostleship, as a permanent office in the church, are no where stated. Even supposing that an explicit statement of the fact might easily have been omitted, which we do not grant, and that the absence of any unequivocal application of the name may be accounted for, which seems impossible, the question still arises, why are the qualifications of an "Apostle-bishop" not revealed? It is not enough to say, because Paul or Peter has not left epistles to those who were to consecrate Apostle-bishops. Granting the fact, why was not such a revelation made? Were the instructions to Timothy and Titus, as to "Presbyter-bishops," given without necessity? If not, why was not an occasion sought or made for giving the qualifications of Apostles? Because this office demands none in particular, or because it is less important than the others? It may be said, indeed, that we have no right to inquire why certain things have been revealed and others not. But this would be a mere evasion of the argument by the misapplication of an acknowledged principle. The question is not what should have been, but what has been revealed; and if both parties are agreed that certain offices are recognised in the New Testament, and the qualifications for those offices carefully detailed, and if one of the parties alleges that another office is there recognised, the other party has a right to ask how the omission of its qualifications is to be explained upon the opposite hypothesis. This would be the case, even if the disputed office were the lowest. If, for example, the qualifications of Deacons had no where been given, the evidence of such an office, as a permanent order in the church, would be much less conclusive than that of the Presbyterate, although Deacons are expressly mentioned, in connexion with the Presbyters or Bishops, in two of Paul's



epistles. How much inferior, then, is the evidence that Apostles were permanent officers of the church, when both these proofs are wanting. And how much weaker still when we consider the paramount importance attached to the apostolic office by the adverse party.

Even admitting, then, that no occasion does present itself in the New Testament, as it stands, for the detail of the qualifications of Apostles, that very circumstance increases, in a high degree, the improbability that such an office was intended to be permanently established. But this admission is gratuitous. By whom were subsequent apostles to be consecrated, if not by their predecessors in the office? If, then, Timothy and Titus were apostles, and addressed as such in Paul's epistles, why does he not instruct them in relation to the paramount importance of admitting only qualified men to that high station? Is it because the same qualifications which are required in presbyters are also required in apostles? Even if this were so, the great alleged superiority of the apostolic office would entitle it to the honour of a separate enactment, especially as presbyters and deacons are distinctly treated, though the qualifications for these two offices are almost identical. This difficulty is not merely theoretical but practical; for how are the qualifications of Apostle-bishops now to be determined? By what test shall they be judged? Those described in the first chapter of Acts are totally inapplicable to all modern cases. How then is it to be ascertained whether those admitted now to the alleged rank of Apostles, are as certainly possessed of the necessary qualifications as Presbyters and Deacons who are tried by the directions which Paul gave to Timothy and Titus? We do not maintain that this omission is itself sufficient to disprove the perpetuity of the Apostolic office, but merely that it renders it so far improbable as to require the most explicit proof to establish it.

But even this is not a full view of the subject of apostolical qualifications. It is not only true that no account is given of the qualifications of Apostle-bishops, as permanent officers in the church, after it had been planted by the original Apostles; but also that the qualifications which are given of an original Apostle, are of such a nature as to discountenance, in a high degree, the opinion that the office was intended to be perma-

ment. When the death of Judas made a vacancy in the apostolic body, the disciples proceeded to elect a successor, and Peter, in the name of the eleven, declared the qualifications which were requisite. These were (1) that the candidate should have been one of Christ's original followers; (2) that he should be a witness of the resurrection. (Acts i. 22.) The obvious *prima facie* inference from this is certainly that none could be apostles who were destitute of these qualifications. And this is very much confirmed by the case of Paul, who seems not to have known the Saviour personally, during his abode on the earth, but who, in vindicating his own claim to an equality of rank with the eleven, says expressly, "Have I not seen the Lord Jesus?"—thereby admitting that to have seen him was necessary to the apostolic character. This might be urged, with plausibility at least, as a direct proof that the apostolic office was a temporary one, because the number of those who had actually seen Christ after his resurrection, was limited and must soon be exhausted. All that we now allege, however, is, that the absence of express declarations, that the Apostolic office was continued in the church, is the more difficult to be explained on the opposite hypothesis, because when the qualifications of church officers are given, in two separate epistles, those of Apostles are not included; and because the only requisites prescribed in the election of a man to fill a vacancy in the original apostolic body, are precisely such as cannot be possessed by any men at present.

It may, however, be alleged, that, although the permanence of the apostolic office is not explicitly asserted; and although the qualifications of Apostle-bishops are not given; and although the name Apostle, in its highest sense, is not applied to any but the original thirteen; others are, nevertheless, spoken of as actually exercising apostolic powers; and that as it is the thing, and not the name, which is really in question, this is sufficient to establish the perpetuity of the Apostleship. Before proceeding to examine the grounds of this allegation, there are two preliminary observations to be made upon it.

1. The omission of the name Apostle is by no means an unimportant circumstance. The title was not so regarded in the original institution. It did not grow out of circumstances, nor was it, in any sense, the result of accident. It is not said, in an incident-

tal way, that the twelve were called apostles, as it is said that the disciples were called Christians at Antioch; but we are told, that our Lord "called unto him his disciples, and of them he chose twelve, whom also HE NAMED APOSTLES." (Luke vi. 13.) The office and the name were conferred by the same authority. When the persons thus chosen are afterwards mentioned, it is commonly by the name which Christ bestowed at first, or by that of "the twelve," denoting their limited number. This is especially the case after our Lord's ascension, when there seems to be no case of the Apostles, in the strict sense, being called by any indefinite name. Now these two facts, viz. that the name was coeval with the office, and is recorded as a matter of some moment; and that the original Apostles are almost always, and after Christ's ascension always, called by it or some other title equally definite—render it *a priori* highly probable, that if the office was to be continued, the name would be continued with it; and that if continued in common parlance it would be applied in the New Testament; and that if applied at all, it would be applied with greater frequency than ever after the name had been extended to a multitude of persons. How is it that as the number of apostles increased, the mention of the name becomes less frequent, even when the organization of the church, and the qualifications of its officers, are the subject of discourse? These considerations will, perhaps, suffice to show, that the failure to establish the explicit application of the name Apostle to the alleged successors of the original thirteen, is by no means a matter of indifference, even if it can be shown that they possessed and exercised apostolic powers. Not that the actual possession and exercise of peculiar apostolic powers does not prove them to have been apostles, but that the omission of the title makes it harder to establish the fact of such possession and exercise, and entitles us to call for more explicit proof than would otherwise be necessary.

2. Before the exercise of apostolic powers by persons not of the original thirteen can be adduced in proof of the permanent continuance of the apostolic office, it must be determined what are apostolic powers. It cannot mean all the powers of the original apostles; for some of these are admitted, on both sides, to have ceased. It cannot mean any of these powers indefinitely; for some of them are admitted, on both sides, to be lawfully

exercised by presbyters; and this would prove that presbyters are the successors of the apostles in the highest of their powers which did not cease. If the possession of any apostolic powers is a proof of the succession, then the succession is in presbyters. If the possession of all the apostolic powers is necessary to establish a succession, then there is none at all. Either of these conclusions would be fatal to the adverse argument, which cannot have the slightest force, except on two conditions—(1) that the apostolic powers, shown to have been exercised by persons not of the original thirteen, be such as are not acknowledged to have ceased—(2) that they be such as were not exercised by Presbyters. For if they were powers possessed by Presbyters, their exercise proves nothing but the continuance of that office, which is not disputed; and if they were powers which have ceased, their exercise in apostolic times proves nothing as to the rights and powers of any office now existing in the church. With these preliminary observations, we here leave the subject, reserving to a future time the full exhibition of our fourth argument against the perpetuity of the Apostolic office, which is, that no peculiar apostolic powers are said in scripture to have been exercised by any person, who was not either an original apostle or a presbyter.

---

ART. III.—*Ignatius von Antiochien und seine Zeit. Sieben Send-schreiben an Dr. August Neander; von C. C. J. Bunsen. Hamburg. 1847.*

The personal history of Ignatius can be told in a few sentences; his writings, including all that bear his name, could be published in a single newspaper of ordinary size: while a full account of the controversies to which his writings have given rise would fill a considerable volume. According to a tradition intrinsically probable, and generally received, he was in his youth a scholar of the Apostles. He was settled in the pastoral charge of the church of Antioch, about A. D. 70; and remained in that important post, until his martyrdom A. D. 110–113. The emperor Trajan on his way to the east, stopped for some



time at Antioch—the third city in the world for wealth, extent and population, and the capital of the orient; during the sojourn of the emperor, Ignatius is summoned before him to give an account of his faith; for his noble confession of Christ, he is condemned to die, and ordered to be sent to Rome, to be exposed to wild beasts in the amphitheatre. As he slowly travelled towards the distant scene of his martyrdom, he wrote letters to personal friends and to Christian congregations, which, with similar productions of his contemporaries, Clement of Rome, and Polycarp of Smyrna, constitute the oldest uninspired monument of Christian literature.

The writings of these apostolical fathers no more form part of our rule of faith, than the works of the Reformers; but to the ecclesiastical historian they are of inestimable value. Indeed, next to the sacred record, there is no ancient document, of which it is so important that we have the *ipsissima verba*, as of these letters; the official position of their authors, their intelligence, and devoted piety render them perfectly reliable witnesses as to what was the faith of the church, and what the form of her government in the age immediately succeeding that of the apostles. Accordingly we find that the controversy respecting the Ignatian Epistles fills a much larger space, and has been more earnestly prosecuted than any similar discussion respecting any other author of the first three centuries. Why the falsifiers of early days, who really seem to have adopted the principle that forgery “is good if a man use it lawfully” selected Ignatius in preference to others, that they might convert him into a witness to doctrines which he never held, and an author of works which he never wrote, is uncertain. But that he has been thus treated,—that testimonies in favour of prelacy, and of Arianism have been put into his mouth, is a point—we may almost say—universally conceded. With respect to the first of the topics just mentioned, the pious forger, however, executed his work in a very bungling way; he has contrived to invest the venerable father with a lordly character, wholly unlike that of his contemporaries, but he has not succeeded in making him testify in favor of Prelacy, as it now exists. For even allowing the genuineness of the longer epistles, the kind of Episcopacy developed in them is not diocesan but parochial. Still it is quite obvious, from the tone of the interpolations and additions, from the

great importance attached to them by modern Prelatists like Hammond and Pearson,\* and their zealous defence of their purity, that the aim of the falsifier was to secure for the hierarchy of the fourth century, the apparent sanction of one of the most eminent fathers of the first.

The earliest editions of the Greek text of Ignatius, viz., those of Pacaeus 1557, Gesner 1559, contained the twelve longer epistles. Among the first who questioned their genuineness, were the Magdeburg centuriators, though they did it in a cautious and hesitating tone. Calvin, with his usual perspicacity, saw through the fraud, and expressed himself respecting it in just such terms as might be expected from a man of his thorough honesty. "Nihil enim naeniis illis," said he, "quae subnomine Ignatii editae sunt, putidius." Cartwright, Perkins, Scultetus and other leading divines of the Protestant church, adopted the same opinion, partly on internal evidence, and partly from the great diversities which were found to exist in the manuscripts. With the exception of such high-church Anglicans as Whitgift, who insisted upon the genuineness of everything bearing the name of Ignatius, the whole Protestant world agreed in regarding only seven of these epistles, viz., those to the Ephesians, Magnesians, Trallians, Romans, Philadelphians, Smyrneans, and Polycarp, as the productions of Ignatius. Even these seven though held to be in the main genuine, were believed on good grounds to have been considerably interpolated. Under the influence of this belief Primate Usher engaged in those researches which resulted in the discovery of a Latin translation exhibiting a text materially differing from that of the received Greek. It contained the seven recognized epistles, but in a greatly abbreviated form—hence called the *Shorter Epistles*. He published an edition of it in 1644. About the same time that Usher made his discovery, Isaac Vossius found in the Medici library at Florence a Greek manuscript copy of the same epistles, agreeing very nearly with the Latin translation. From the first appearance of the *Shorter Epistles*, the same difference of opinion existed, as had previously obtained re-

\* Inea (Controv. Episcop.) autem tractanda magni ponderis merito habita est S. Ignatii viri apostolici et martyris auctoritas, cujus dissertissimo locupletissimoque testimonio, cum Episcopalis causa fulciatur, et paritatis Presbyterianae antiquitas nuper excogitata concidat. Pearson Vind. Ignat. cap. I.

specting the Longer;\* the high churchmen, who had so pertinaciously maintained that every line of the latter came from the pen of Ignatius, quietly abandoned a position which they suddenly found no longer tenable, but without learning either wisdom or candour from the past, they just took the same stand in favour of the absolute purity of the shorter text; on the other the leading theologians of the Reformed churches insisted that it was corrupted, though they did not pretend to be able to identify the interpolations. The whole subject was thoroughly discussed by Bishop Pearson on the one side in his *Vindiciae Ignat.* and by Daillé in his *De Scriptis Ignatii* on the other; by Bishop Beveridge, Hammond, Cotelerius, LeClerc, Blondel, L'Arroque and Jameson. In fact, it was one of the chief theological questions of the latter part of the 17th century; and incidentally the discussion has been often renewed since. High churchmen have all along asserted that the Shorter Epistles are unadulterated, with the same pertinacity with which the Whitgifts and the Bilsons defended the Longer; though not a few candid Episcopalians of later times have owned that all the passages in the Ignatian epistles bearing on the episcopal office are more than suspicious. Still it could not be proved with absolute certainty that they are not genuine; and it seemed as if the controversy about what Ignatius did, and what he did not write was one which must remain forever undecided.

The appearance of M. Bunsen's work forms a new era in the history of the Ignatian controversy. If party interests had not so much to do with the formation and the maintenance of opinions, if men were as open to the force of evidence as they claim to be, we should look for a change of sentiment on this subject quite as great as that produced in the days of Usher, by the discovery of the shorter recension. However this may be, one thing is certain, that every candid reader of the work before us will be compelled to admit that the views of Blondell and Daillé are completely established, and that the testimonies so often quoted and so highly prized by the advocates of the hierarchy are the worthless coinage of pious fraud. In a word, the long

\* Thus Grotius in a letter to G. Vossius, dated 22d Aug. 1643, says of Blondell: "Ignatii epistolas quas filius tuus ex Italia attulit puras ab omni bus illis quae eruditi hac tenus suspecta habuere? admitte non vult, quia episcopatum vetustati clarum praebent testimonium."—*Erudit Vir Epist. H. Wetstein*, p. 825.

agitated question respecting the Ignatian epistles is settled, by the discovery of the Syriac Version of them which M. Bunsen has been at the pains to edit and illustrate.

It was long ago intimated by Usher, by Dr. Fell of Oxford and by Renaudot of France, that if ever the genuine text of Ignatius was found, it would be in a Syriac translation. The discovery by the two Assemani of a Syriac manuscript containing "The Acts of the Martyrdom of Ignatius" awakened the hope that such a version would yet be brought to light. More recently Mr. Cureton of the British Museum, found among the papers of the late Mr. Rich a Syriac manuscript containing a portion of the "Martyrdom," and appended to it a part of the epistle to the Romans. In 1839 Dr. Tatam the learned Coptic scholar, presented to the British Museum a large number of Syriac manuscripts which he obtained from the monasteries in the Lybian desert. On examining them, Mr. Cureton to his great delight found in a manuscript of the early part of the 6th century, the Letter to Polycarp in a Syriac version evidently made by a man of learning, and with great care. The curators of the Museum at once resolved thoroughly to explore a field whose first fruits were so precious and promising; they accordingly, in 1842 sent Dr. Tatam to Egypt, with orders to make the fullest search, and to secure all the remaining manuscripts, at any cost. His mission was crowned with success; and in March 1843 he returned with two hundred and forty-six manuscripts on parchment, and seventy on paper. Some of them are probably the oldest manuscripts in Europe, their dates ranging from A. D. 411 to 1292. Among them is a Syriac version of the long lost Theophania of Eusebius. At the end of a work of an unknown author (the first few pages being lost) is the following inscription—"The First Epistle of the holy Ignatius to Polycarp." At the end of this letter, in the middle of the page, and without any break or dividing space, is "The Second Epistle of the same to the Ephesians." At the end of this letter and again without a break, comes "The Third Epistle of the same to the Romans." The whole concludes with the following remarkable statement: "Here end The Three Epistles of Ignatius, Bishop and Martyr."

This version was probably made early in the 2d century by Procopius, who according to Eusebius translated many works



into the Aramean. That was the flourishing period of Syrian literature; and when we remember, that next to the Holy Scriptures, the Syrian church most highly prized the letters of their oldest pastor, it is quite supposable that they were translated soon after the death of Ignatius. However this may be, it is evident that the translator was a native Syrian, that he was well acquainted with Greek, and that he translated only three of the Epistles, and these too in their shortest form. M. Bunsen's position is, that these three Epistles as given in the Syriac version are the only genuine productions of Ignatius, and in this volume he investigates the subject under the guidance of the established principles of philological and historical criticism.

The volume is divided into two parts. The first is entitled "*Ignatius und seine Zeit*," and consists of seven letters addressed to Neander, for whom he manifests the most affectionate veneration. The second is addressed to Lachmann, and contains, 1. The Greek text of the three genuine letters restored from the Syriac, with a German translation. 2. A comparative view of the various recensions of the genuine epistles, viz. the Restored Greek, the Syriac in a literal Latin version—the Mediccan—the Longer, and at the bottom of the page, the Latin version found by Usher. 3. The four supposititious epistles in Greek and Latin; to each of the seven are appended critical scholia.

M. Bunsen sets out with a discussion of the question, "Is the Syriac translation of the three letters to Polycarp, the Ephesians and the Romans only an abbreviation of the original text, or does it exhibit that text?" In replying to this inquiry he first of all deals with the probabilities of the case. Which, he asks, is the most probable that the Syriac is an abbreviation, or the common text an enlargement of the genuine? Mr. Cureton, with all his Anglican prejudices in favour of the system which the latter is supposed to support, is forced to admit that the balance of probabilities is decidedly on the side of the Syriac. For example, the passages which it wants, consist of three classes; the first includes those (decidedly the most numerous) which refer to the divine authority of bishops; the second, those which bear upon the doctrine of the Trinity; the third, personal narratives and greetings of particular friends by name.

Now as respects the last class, there is no conceivable reason for their omission by the Syriac translator; on the contrary, it

might be supposed that these personal and local references would to Syrians possess a peculiar charm. How, or why then, should these passages, if genuine, be left out? They are not long; there is not the shadow of proof that the translator was careless or unfaithful; his work in fact, from first to last bears the character of a translation prepared with painful care. And then as to the other two classes, perhaps it may be argued that the translator did not believe in the doctrine of the divinity of Christ, and was opposed to the Episcopal constitution of the church. But Mr. Cureton has proved by indubitable evidence that he was a decided friend of the orthodox faith. Nor can it be said that a falsifier would not have dared to put into the mouth of a venerable martyr like Ignatius words and sentiments which he never uttered, for ecclesiastical literature abounds with similar interpolations, of so early a date, that even the fathers of the 4th and 5th centuries were suspicious of them.

The force of this argument in favour of the truthfulness of the Syriac version, is greatly enhanced by considering the history of the Syrian church. From the time of the council of Ephesus, A. D. 431, this church was decidedly Nestorian. Hence it would not be surprising, if we found in a Syrian collection of the letters of Ignatius—supposing it to have been made after the date just mentioned—some traces of Nestorianism. No such traces are to be discovered in this translation; it contains passages directly opposed to this system. In truth, nothing can be more improbable than the supposition that it is the work of a Nestorian; on the contrary, all the proofs in the case go to show that it was made long before the days of Nestorius himself.

Having thus disposed of the probabilities of the case, M. Bunsen next proceeds to institute a careful and minute comparison between the Syriac version, and the common text of the three epistles. The first of these—to Polycarp—has been hitherto regarded by critics as the most corrupt in the whole collection. Even Halloix the Jesuit, one of the most zealous defenders of the Medicean text, declares that it contains many things very stumbling to him, particularly the tone used in addressing a brother bishop. Usher too, though hardly willing to allow a doubt to be cast on the purity of the common text, excludes it from the number of the genuine epistles of Ignatius. Yet there is really nothing remarkable or stumbling in the letter, when we bear

in mind that it consists of the last words of a venerable servant of Christ, just ready to seal his testimony with his blood, addressed to a young fellow-labourer. All the objections to its genuineness rest upon passages whose true meaning has been darkened or perverted by false readings. The whole letter may be divided into four parts; the first containing counsels to Polycarp with reference to his faith as a Christian and a pastor; the second relates to his conduct as a bishop, in his commerce with the world, and his contests with the times, closing with a noble exposition of the comparative value of the temporal and the eternal; the third lays down rules of conduct towards the several classes of which his pastoral charge was composed; and thus he is naturally led, in the last place, to speak of the collective assembly. In giving direction as to the proper management of the various classes of the congregation, Ignatius refers to those who were in bondage, and on this subject holds the same language with Paul in 1 Cor. vii. 21.\* He knew that the mighty power of the gospel, if allowed to have free course, would in due time correct this and all the other evils of the social state; but he also knew that any attempt to remove them by the mere force of ecclesiastical laws would be not only fruitless but pernicious.

Thus far all is coherent; but now comes a statement which completely breaks the natural train of thought. "Flee evil arts," *τας κακοτεχνιας φευγε*; *μαλλον δε περι τούτων ὁμιλιαν ποιοῦ*.† Mr. Bunsen is strongly of opinion that there could be no ground for giving any such direction to a man like Polycarp; and as the reading is found both in the Syriac and the common text, he thinks that an error consisting of two letters had very early crept into the text. He amends it by changing *τεχνιας* into *τεχνουσ*, making the whole passage refer to the female members of the congregation, who are expressly mentioned in the next sentence: "Likewise command my sisters that they love their own husbands," &c.

The closing sentence in the Syriac version is short and natural: "A Christian has no power over himself, but ever waits upon God: I salute him who shall be deemed worthy to go

\* M. Bunsen translates this passage—"kannst du frei werden, so bediene dich lieber der Freiheit; sonst bedenke, das du frei bist in Christus."

† In the Larger Epist. the reading is *μη ποιοῦ*.

to Syria in my place, even as I directed you." Instead of this brief and simple statement, which is precisely such as we should expect from Ignatius in his circumstances at the time, the Medicean text has a long passage amounting to two sections, in which the natural order of ideas is entirely destroyed. With this exception, the epistle to Polycarp has been much less corrupted than any other. In our present investigation, it is of great importance because it supplies a test by which to try the other letters, as to their style, structure and contents. We discover in it a compressed brevity, a sharply defined personality, and a simple style remote from everything like rhetorical amplification. The language is good Hellenistic Greek, formed on the model of the epistles of Paul and John. On the other hand, the falsified passages exhibit a corrupt Hellenism, and a style extremely redundant. This observation particularly applies to the epistle to the Ephesians, which has been largely interpolated for the obvious purpose of magnifying the prelate's office.

In order to judge of this rightly, it is necessary to look at the general scope of this epistle, and the coherence of its several parts. These are four. In the 1st, or the introduction, Ignatius thanks the Ephesians for the affectionate interest they had manifested for him, and expresses his confidence in their piety. In the 2d, he declares to them the indispensable necessity of a holy life—"live," says he, "a God-pleasing life, as those who are living stones in the true temple." The 3d part counsels them how to act towards those beyond the pale of Christian fellowship. They should diligently labour for their salvation, and should manifest in their conduct an ever active, all enduring love, which is the essence of Christianity, and the most efficient means to attract those who are without. Then follows a highly animated passage—a sudden burst of holy feeling, excited by a glimpse of the glories of the cross—"My soul sinks down before the glory of the cross, so full of mysteries concealed from the princes of this world," &c. What thoughts could be more natural than these, or more suitable in a farewell letter to a beloved sister congregation?

Now in the Medicean copy, the two sentences—"Thanks be to Him who has given you grace to be worthy of such a bishop—But since love does not permit me to be silent, I entreat you to



run together in the will of God"—are separated by an interpolation of two long sections, and are followed by another of no less than four. In one of these passages Burrhus, Euplus, Crokus and Fronto, are spoken of as members of the embassy sent to him from Ephesus, while the genuine text names Onesimus alone; in the others, absolute obedience to the bishop is insisted upon, as an essential condition of holiness and salvation. "Being subject in all things to the bishop and the presbytery, ye are sanctified." "Let us hasten therefore to be obedient to the bishop, that we may be obedient to God." "When any one sees the bishop silent, let him be so much the more afraid." Such are the expressions employed on this subject with an excessive frequency. A little farther on, we meet with a still more violent disruption of two closely connected sentences.—"Strive not to imitate the unconverted, but be imitators of the Lord, for who was ever so much abused as he.—But this (imitation) is not a mere profession, it is rather done by those alone who continue to the end in the power of faith." Between these two sentences, which so obviously ought to follow each other, a long passage amounting to four sections has been foisted in. The limits of our article will not permit us to notice all the other interpolations of this epistle; the examples already adduced may serve to give some idea of the manner in which the letters of Ignatius have been treated, and of the extent to which they have been corrupted; but the strong contrast between the two texts, the natural, truthful, life-like air of the Syriac version, and the precisely opposite features of the common text can be fully appreciated only by those who will be at the pains to read the two consecutively.

The epistle to the Romans—which is next discussed—casts more light on the personal character of Ignatius than either of the others. According to the Syriac version, it was written by him when near the end of his journey to the capital; the Medicean text, on the other hand, represents it as written at Ephesus. The Syriac account on this point is much the most probable, because it agrees best with the whole tone of the epistle, and with the design of Ignatius which seems to have been, to induce the Romans to throw no obstacles in the way of his winning the martyr's crown. The interpolations of this letter however are neither so numerous nor so important as those of the epistle

to the Ephesians; we therefore forbear entering into a particular notice of them.

Before leaving this epistle Mr. Bunsen examines a question, which critics hitherto have not been able satisfactorily to answer, viz: why was Ignatius sent to Rome? Some have held that this journey never was made; but the fact however explained, must be admitted, or else all the epistles bearing his name must be set aside as forgeries, for we find allusions to it in each of them. Scaliger, Rivet, and Basnage put the case in this form. If Ignatius was a Roman citizen how could he be condemned to wild beasts? If he was not a Roman citizen, how could he appeal to the emperor, and in virtue of his appeal be sent to Rome? Here is a dilemma, both horns of which are unpleasantly sharp, and the advocates of the common text not knowing which to choose, have concluded that the safest course is to be silent on the subject. Not a word, however, is said in any of these epistles about an appeal; Ignatius simply describes himself as one who had been condemned to fight with beasts, and was therefore sent to Rome under military escort. Vossius attempts to get over the difficulty by referring to a passage in the Pandects in which, as he says, provincial governors were authorized to send the ring-leaders of insurrections to Rome; but in the place alluded to, the persons mentioned are not "ring-leaders," but men of remarkable strength and skill. The passage in question, however, warrants the inference that before the days of Severus, governors of provinces were allowed under certain circumstances to send malefactors to the capital, with a view to their gratifying the people, by taking a share in the cruel sports of the amphitheatre. No citizen, whether Christian or pagan, could indeed be condemned to such a death. That Ignatius was not a citizen is expressly asserted by himself, as M. Bunsen thinks, in the following words;—"I do not command you like Paul and Peter; they were apostles, I am a prisoner; they were freemen, I am even now a servant,"—words, as he holds, which must be understood in their literal sense. But our limits warn us not to enlarge on points of this kind.

M. Bunsen having thus shown the superior claims of the Syriac text of the three letters found in that version, and which he affirms are the only genuine epistles of Ignatius, proceeds to examine the remaining four, viz. to the Magnesians, the

Trallians, the Philadelphians, and the Smyrniāns, and to adduce the evidences, that they are entirely suppositious. We have already had occasion to remark that the undoubted and the interpolated portions of the genuine epistles are each marked by peculiar features. In the latter we always find the same style; instead of the compact brevity of Ignatius, great prolixity; instead of his fullness of thought sharply defined and strongly expressed, rhetorical flourishes, in which the poverty of ideas is proportioned to the multitude of words. Even when we encounter an Ignatian idea, it is feebly and awkwardly brought out. Now if these identical features are found in the four epistles above named,—if between the four doubtful epistles, taken as a whole or in their particular parts, and the three undoubted epistles there is the same contrast as between the undoubted and the interpolated portions of the latter, the presumption that the former are wholly false is very strong. If in addition to this, we find the author in the polemical parts of the epistles contending against heresies which were unknown until long after the death of Ignatius, the presumption of falsity rises to indubitable certainty. Let us then, as briefly as possible, examine these epistles in the order in which they stand in the Medicean manuscript.

The first is addressed to the Magnesians. It consists of two parts, the first including the chapters from the first to the seventh. The Magnesians are commanded to yield implicit submission to their bishops as standing in loco Dei. The injunction is repeated usque ad nauseam;—the whole passage is manifestly the product of the same pen which composed the portion of the epistle to the Ephesians, where the episcopal office is so highly glorified. Widely different is the whole tone of this letter from that which the true Ignatius uses when addressing Polycarp on the same subject. In the latter he exhorts the Christian people to manifest a proper respect for those set over them in the Lord, or in other words to honour the ministry as an institution of Christ; but in the letter to the Magnesians, the bishop is every thing, and the people nothing; they must render absolute obedience to his behests, and no man must presume to exercise his own mind, or to think differently from “the lord over God’s heritage.”

But the second part—extending from chapter eight to the

end—contains the most decisive proof that the whole thing is a forgery. It is found in the passage in which the Magnesians are warned against “other doctrines and old and useless fables.” The heresies referred to are:—1. That of the Sabbatarians, who observed the seventh instead of the first or Lord’s day: 2. The doctrine that Christ did not proceed eternally from the Father, but was the offspring of eternal Silence (Σιγή): 3. That the death of our Lord, and his whole earthly life were not realities, but merely seemed to be such. Now this last heresy, as all who have investigated the subject agree in holding, originated in the school of Valentinus. This man, according to Irenæus, came to Rome about A. D. 130, was in great repute there from A. D. 133 till 154, and was still living, A. D. 163.

Pierson, who undertook, as we have already stated, to establish the genuineness and the purity of all the epistles, found this a very troublesome place. How does he get over it? By asserting that the reference is not to the heresy of the Docetæ but to that of the Ebionites, and by translating the passage in a way which violates the plainest rules of grammar. If the doctrine of the Docetæ be really described here, why he asks with singular simplicity—why did not Irenæus quote it when discussing the tenets of that sect? For the very good reason that there was no such passage to quote; it was clearly impossible for him to adduce a testimony from Ignatius, against a heresy which was never heard of until long after he was in his grave.

The next is the epistle to the Trallians. Artistically considered, it is decidedly inferior to the preceding. The Introduction is to the last degree bombastic—so that it is scarcely possible to make any sense of it. It abounds with commands to honour and obey the bishop, conveyed in language even more offensive than that employed in the epistle to the Magnesians. We also meet with warnings against heresies which had no existence in the days of Ignatius, viz. of those who denied the reality of our Saviour’s human nature, his earthly life, and death upon the cross. There is one circumstance connected with this epistle, which Mr. Bunsen regards as furnishing conclusive evidence that the forged letters and the interpolations in the genuine are the productions of one and the same man; it is the fact that the last section has been transferred from the epistle to the Romans where it properly belongs. As it stands in the



letter to the Trallians, the passage is almost senseless, while in its proper place it is full of meaning. There is an indirect allusion in it to the contrast between the oriental and the Roman mind,—the speculative, mystical tendencies of the former as displayed in its conceptions of the Christian system, and the decidedly practical turn of the latter. Ignatius tells his Roman brethren that there were many things connected with the heavenly world about which he might discourse to them; but he forbore to do so, as he was aware that topics of this kind, while peculiarly interesting to an oriental, would not be so well relished by a Roman—whose taste ran upon the ethics of the Gospel rather than its mysteries. He does not say this in so many words; but such is undoubtedly the drift of the passage.

Each of the remaining two epistles—to the Philadelphians and the Smyrnians—contains evidences of falsity, of precisely the same kind with those already adduced and just as conclusive. There is the same glorification of the episcopal office—and warnings against the Docetian heresy similar to those addressed to the Magnesians and the Trallians. It is therefore unnecessary to enlarge upon this branch of the subject, as it would be a mere repetition of what has been said already.

We have thus indicated as briefly as possible, the grounds on which it is maintained that the Syriac version includes all the genuine epistles of Ignatius, and exhibits these in their purest form. Of its high antiquity there can be no doubt, yet no one pretends that it was made directly from the originals. The copy from which it was derived probably was not immaculate; the translator may have mistaken the sense in some places; and even his work, like all similar writings, probably has suffered somewhat by transcription. That there are some false readings in it, M. Bunsen thinks is not only probable but certain; at the same time it conveys far more exactly than any other recension, and with as much accuracy as we may ever hope to attain, the views of Ignatius respecting the essential doctrines of the Christian faith, and those principles of church polity which have occasioned, in past ages, and still call forth so much discussion.

Thus far the investigation has been mainly of a philological character, and a negative result has been reached; in other words, there is evidence derived from the established rules of

criticism, that a large part of the writings bearing the name of Ignatius must be rejected as spurious. Is there any positive proof of the genuineness of the residuum? Baur, and others of the Tübingen school maintain that all are spurious—that all the letters ascribed to Ignatius, Clement, and Polycarp, are forgeries. Mr. Bunsen devotes a large space to the refutation of this Tübingen conceit—much larger than it deserves—and conclusively establishes the fact—admitted by all historical inquirers, a few such men as Baur alone excepted, that the letters of the apostolic fathers are in the main, what they claim to be. In doing this, he portrays the times of these fathers, taking a rapid but comprehensive view of the condition of the church, her subjective faith, her discipline and government during this period. With reference to the Ignatian epistles, he asks, do the *three* which remain after having subjected the whole to the test of philological criticism, bear the positive impress of the Ignatian age? Do they, so far as they go, exhibit the faith of the church at this precise epoch, and the form of polity which then obtained? He answers these questions in the affirmative; the three epistles as given in the Syriac version, have the true stamp, and only these. This branch of the argument is by far the most interesting and important, because it involves the practical inquiry what doctrines, and what polity did Ignatius hold—with which one of the various parties in later times, that have been accustomed to appeal to his authority, has the genuine Ignatius the strongest affinity?

On the first of these points—the doctrinal character of his letters—it may suffice to say that the views of Ignatius respecting the fundamental truths of the Gospel, the person and work of Christ, the way of salvation, the nature, necessity and author of sanctification, are exactly those which obtain among evangelical Christians of the present day. The city of which he was pastor, was the centre of primitive missions to the Gentile world—a sort of metropolis of Gentile Christianity, a circumstance which may have led him to study the character of the great apostle to the Gentiles, and imitate its peculiar features; whatever may have been the cause, it is certain that the cast of Ignatius' mind, and the tone of his theology are decidedly Pauline. He magnifies the riches of that grace which contrived and executed the scheme of redemption; with him, Christ is all in all. Not a syllable can be

found in any of his epistles, which even seems to countenance the noxious tenets of those who teach that the water of baptism necessarily regenerates, and who put the church in the place of her Divine Lord. We cannot find the first trace of this system of doctrine in the Ignatian epistles. But we pass on to consider their bearing upon the second point—ecclesiastical polity.

In bringing out the views of Ignatius on this subject, Mr. Bunsen is led by the necessities of his argument to trace the successive changes in the government of the church, from the days of the apostles, down to the era when the hierarchy was fully developed. He begins by observing that a reader of the New Testament who had never heard of the theological contests of the last two centuries, would hardly believe it possible that any one could be found to deny that Bishop and Presbyter or Elder are convertible terms. That they are used to designate the same officer, is sufficiently evident from 1 Tim. iii. 1–7, compared with Tit. i. 5–9; it is equally plain from other passages of the New Testament, that, towards the close of Paul's life, i. e. a few years before the destruction of Jerusalem, each church was governed by a college of elders or presbyters aided by a bench of deacons. In Acts xx. 17–28, the same persons, in one part of Paul's address are styled "presbyters (or elders) of the church," in another "bishops" or overseers. Again, in Phil. i. 1, "Paul and Timothy the servants of Jesus Christ" send their greeting "to all the saints which are at Phillippi with the bishops and deacons." These are the only places in the New Testament where the word *Bishop* occurs. Rothe, has directed attention to the fact that Peter, whenever he has occasion to speak of the overseers of the church, always uses the term *Presbyter* because it was one with which the Jewish Christians were familiar, just as the Gentile Christians were with the word *Επισκοπος* which Paul employs. In the epistle to the Hebrews a phrase differing from both these is chosen (*ἡγουμενοι*) "obey them *that have the rule over you.*" Coming down to a still later period, in the Apocalypse of John we meet with the term *Angel* as a designation of the pastor of a church. And finally, near the close of the first century, we have in the third epistle of the same Apostle, (as Rothe further remarks,) not indeed the title of *Prelate*, but a picture of one; a prelate who seems to have possessed great power in the congregation, and

who exercised it in the way of "casting men out of the church," with an energy not inferior to that of Henry of Exeter in modern days. His name was Diotrephes—the first historical Prelate. Here the records of inspiration terminate; after this, no man, no church can pretend to *know* any thing respecting the organization of the early Christian societies, beyond what may be learned from the epistles of Clement written about the end of the first century, and those of Ignatius about the beginning of the second;—epistles, which, as mere human, though we doubt not, truthful testimonies respecting matters of fact, are not to be put upon a level with the infallible word of God, our only rule of faith.

The passages in the New Testament bearing upon the earliest constitution of the church are not numerous; but few as they are, there cannot be two opinions as to their meaning among readers free from partisan prejudices. By what steps did the church pass from her earliest form to the organization existing in the second and third centuries? This question has been often asked; by the fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries, by the reformers of the sixteenth, by theologians of the seventeenth, by historians of the nineteenth. In answer to it we observe that the commission given to Timothy and Titus casts light upon the state of things during the period extending from the date of the earliest epistle of Paul down to the oldest of the apostolical fathers. The Apocalypse and the third epistle of John seem to indicate that in Ephesus and in other congregations in Asia Minor, even before the destruction of Jerusalem, a slight change had been made in the form of government, each of these churches, instead of having a college of presbyters, was under the charge of a single pastor. We find, for example, at the close of the first century, Clement the pastor of the church at Rome, Ignatius at Antioch, Polycarp at Smyrna; gradually this plan extended itself, and before the end of the second century, it was universal. Each church had a single pastor—to whom the Greco-Roman term *Episcopus* was applied;—he was assisted by a council of presbyters, all holding the same rank as the bishop, and having the same authority to preach, govern and ordain. Episcopalians indeed maintain that a much greater change was made than that, from a collective pastorate to a single pastor; they affirm that the Apostles or such of them as survived



the destruction of Jerusalem, placed at the head of each church, a bishop, in the modern sense of the word, investing him as the representative of the unity of the church with peculiar powers, and that they established this as the only lawful form of government, and which therefore should be observed by the church universal in all future time. The advocates of this theory have been accustomed to rely upon the authority of Ignatius, of course, taking it for granted that the commonly received text of his epistles is genuine. If they can make out this part of their theory, we are ready to admit their pretensions to the apostolical succession. But the evidence must be decisive and irresistible; for the question to be settled, as Mr. Bunsen remarks, is one of more than ordinary moment; the real point in debate is not merely whether a certain class of men have a divine right to exercise a spiritual authority over the Christian people, but, whether it belongs to them exclusively and unconditionally to determine what is truth, by authoritatively declaring what the Bible means. Did the fathers of the primitive church claim either for themselves individually, or for the collective ministry any such prerogative? Do they any where teach that the Head of the church directly, or through the medium of the Apostles, invested them and their lawful successors with a power like this? How far they were from making such lofty pretensions, may be gathered from the epistle of Clement to the Corinthians. The church of Corinth was rent by intestine divisions. One party claimed that the congregation had the right to compel the presbyters to resign their office, however blameless their conduct, and to appoint others in their place. This power was not only asserted, but exercised. Those who sided with the excluded presbyters complained of the proceeding as unrighteous, at last they agreed to refer the matter to the pastor of Rome. In his reply, there is a long passage in which he says, that the apostles, as they went from city to city preaching the Gospel, ordained in every church "bishops and deacons," who should retain their offices for life, unless guilty of some crime. This passage, which is too long to be quoted, has been subjected to all kinds of torture, in order to make it testify that the Prelate is the true and only successor of the apostles; but no such testimony has been or can be got out of it.

If the Episcopal theory were well founded, Clement should

have addressed the Corinthians in some such strain as the following—"the apostles provided that after their death the bishops should be invested with their authority; now if such successors of the apostles, worthily discharge the duties of their high office by governing the church, ordaining presbyters and deacons, it is a great sin in any people to compel them to resign their bishoprick." But there is nothing like this in his whole letter; it contains not a word about the appointment of successors to the apostles; there is not even the most distant hint that the church of Corinth was under the charge of a single bishop of any kind. On the contrary, he distinctly intimates that it was governed by a college of presbyters. "What a shame—says he—that the old congregation of the Corinthians, through the instigation of one or two persons, should be involved in an uproar against *their Presbyters*."—"I will go where you like, I will do whatever the people (i. e. the congregation) require, only let the flock of Christ be at peace with *their appointed Presbyters*." "You who have occasioned this disturbance submit yourselves to the *Presbyters*." Such language is utterly inexplicable on the supposition that there was a Prelate or Bishop on the spot. If there had been such an officer in the church of Corinth at this time, he could not possibly avoid taking part in the controversy which distracted it; he must have sided with the faction that created the uproar; or, in attempting to sustain the cause of the injured, have found his own authority as little regarded as that of the ejected presbyters. In either case, it would be impossible for Clement to avoid all allusion to him. Yet there is not the most distant hint of this kind. Perhaps it may be said that the office happened to be vacant; the old bishop being dead, and a new one not yet chosen. But this supposition can be proved to be as groundless as the other, for, Clement in this very letter, alluding to the earlier history of the Corinthian church, to its peacefulness and good order, at a time which must have been between the death of Paul, and the breaking out of the present divisions, says—"Once ye acted without respect of persons, being obedient to the commands of God, and subject to *those who have the rule over you*" (τοῖς ἡγουμένοις ὑμῶν); the very expression used in the epistle to the Hebrews xiii. 17.

Here then is a letter from the pastor of the church in the

capital of the empire addressed to a congregation in one of the chief cities of Greece, and written for the express purpose of healing the painful divisions by which it was disturbed. Now if it were true that the apostles ordained prelates as their successors, and invested them with full apostolical authority, this letter of Clement, considering its occasion and object, must be precisely the document to furnish indubitable evidence of the fact. Surely a church like that of Corinth has or ought to have a prelate; or if her turbulent Christians, true to their Greek nature had hitherto refused to allow the episcopal office to be established among them, one of the first injunctions of Clement—himself a prelate—would certainly be that they remodel their church constitution, that they receive and obey a successor of the apostles, and thus get rid of present disorders, as well prevent them for the future. This is what the document in question ought to contain, if the Episcopal theory be true. Whereas, in point of fact, Clement declares, almost in so many words that the church of Corinth neither had been under episcopal government, nor was at that time; and instead of proposing it as the only effectual means of healing their disunion, he earnestly exhorts them to submit to the rule of *their presbyters*. We have already intimated that in Asia Minor, the prevailing form of government during the latter years of the apostle John was congregational episcopacy: but this letter of Clement conclusively proves that at least some of the principal churches in Greece retained the still earlier constitution described in Phil. i. 1.

If from Corinth we pass to the capital of Egypt we shall find proofs equally convincing as those just given, that the dogma—no bishop, no church—was unknown there. The great patriarchal church of Alexandria was for many years under the control of presbyters, who not only elected, but consecrated by imposition of hands, one of their own number to the office of Patriarch. We have the express testimony of Jerome, and of Eutychius to this important fact. Jerome's language is "*presbyteri semper unum ex se electum in excelsiori gradu collocatum episcopum nominabant, quomodo si exercitus imperatorem faciat.*" Some Prelatists unwilling to lose so eminent a man and so learned a theologian, maintain that Jerome is here speaking of the election, not of the ordination of the Alexandrian

bishop, and in support of this exposition make a great deal of the word *nominabant*. Now without going into a verbal exegesis of the passage, we simply affirm that such an explanation is absurd, because the very object for which the fact is mentioned, is to show the original identity of the offices of bishop and presbyter. But besides the evidence of Jerome we have that of Eutychius, himself a Patriarch and historian of Alexandria. His account differs from, but does not contradict the former; his words are,—“*cum vacaret patriarchatus, unum duodecim presbyteris eligerent, cujus capiti reliqui undecim manus imponentes ipsi benedicerent et patriarcham crearent.*” He adds that until the time of the Patriarch Demetrius, A. D. 190, except at Alexandria, there was not a bishop in all Egypt. Demetrius ordained three; his successor, Heraclas, twenty.

That the Alexandrian church was not alone in her ignorance of the doctrine “no bishop, no church,” or in other words, in holding that presbyters had full episcopal authority, appears from the thirteenth canon of the council of Ancyra\* (held about ten years before that of Nice) on the subject of Chorepiscopi. It prohibited them from ordaining presbyters and deacons and also enjoined city presbyters to abstain from such acts unless they had written consent of the bishop of the diocese. Dr. Routh and other prelatie writers have laboured hard to weaken the force of the evidence which this canon furnishes against their theory, by resorting to verbal criticism, and bringing forward various readings whose worthlessness they themselves would be the first to denounce if they were not blinded by party interests and prejudices. In fact they appear to have persuaded themselves that if there is one thing more certain than another it is the doctrine of the apostolical succession, the divine and exclusive right of prelates to govern the church of Christ; this is an ecclesiastical axiom, and therefore if Jerome or Eutychius or any other ancient writer makes a statement that seems to contradict it, either they are misinformed or their language is misunderstood. The canon of the council of Ancyra on the subject of country bishops, cannot possibly have the

\* In commenting on Dr. Routh's philological observations on this canon, Mr. Bunsen says, “In der Klasischen Philologie kommen dergleichen Erklärungsversuche nicht mehr vor: in der biblischen und theologischen muss man nichts für unmöglich halten, so lange die heilige Philologie der Theologen überlassen wird.”



sense indicated by its terms; it cannot possibly be supposed to intimate that chorepiscopi, and city presbyters ever exercised episcopal authority; the council could have intended no more by this canon than simply to warn the chorepiscopi against presuming to ordain presbyters in the large towns and cities. Yet how palpably absurd is this explanation of the act in question? Suppose that the last General Assembly had solemnly enacted, that hereafter no board of trustees should ordain ministers, and that the ruling elders of congregations should not ordain and install their pastors, we venture to say that every one would conclude that the members had taken temporary leave of their senses, when they thus forbade what trustees and elders had never dreamed of doing. Now Dr. Routh and others of his school will have it that the council of Ancyra perpetrated an exactly analogous absurdity, by passing an act prohibiting the chorepiscopi from ordaining city presbyters, when the council very well knew that they never had presumed to ordain even a deacon in the most obscure country village or hamlet. We cannot believe that any ecclesiastical assembly would be guilty of such ridiculous legislation. The canon in question was enacted during one of the transition periods in the history of the church, when prelacy zealously sustained by a newly converted emperor was rapidly developing its energies, though it had not yet become universally established. This accounts for the prohibition; which, at the same time, clearly implies that country bishops and city presbyters had exercised the powers, of which they were now deprived. If the limits of this article permitted, we might bring from the historical records of the first two centuries additional testimonies to show that the nature of the primitive episcopate was such as we have described, and that the claims of the pretended successors of the apostles are historically as groundless as they are destitute of scriptural authority.

The constitutional history of the New Testament church, or the history of the changes in her form and principles of government, from her origin until the complete development of the hierarchy, may be divided, says our author, into *three periods*, of very unequal length.

*The first period* extends from the Ascension of our Lord to the death of Paul, embracing between thirty and forty years.

The church at first consists simply of the apostles and the brethren; this is the primal and for a while the only distinction in the visible body of believers. Very soon the increase of members by thousands renders the erection of a new office necessary, and accordingly seven deacons are ordained. The persecution of which Stephen was the first victim, compels the apostles and their associates to separate for a time; they visit Samaria and other regions, preaching the gospel, and forming their converts into congregations. Each of these had a bench of presbyters or elders, who jointly governed the congregation, all of them being invested with precisely the same powers of ruling, teaching, ordaining others, and administering the sacraments. These societies consisted exclusively of Jewish Christians, and the model of their constitution was naturally taken from the Synagogue. Whether these Presbyters, or to use the Graeco-Roman term, *Episcopoi* (Bishops) were originally chosen for life is uncertain; but before the death of Paul the law was fixed, that unless deposed for misconduct they should discharge their functions while they lived. As for the apostles, we find that they were called and ordained by the Lord himself; they were not ministers of local churches, nor were they charged with the care of particular districts, but held a special relation to the collective church. Theirs was truly an office of exalted dignity; but nowhere in the New Testament are they represented as priests, or as acting the part of mediators between the church and Christ; on the contrary, they plainly taught that there is only "one mediator between God and man," and that all believers are "priests unto God." In congregations fully organized the only helpers employed by the apostles were their regular pastors, viz. the presbyters; while to regions which they were unable to visit, or through which they had passed hastily, Evangelists were sent "to set in order the things that were wanting and ordain elders in every city."

Such seems to have been the constitution of particular Christian societies during this period; the work of teaching, ruling, &c., was performed by a body of presbyters all equal in dignity and power, while the care of the poor, and other temporal concerns were managed by a bench of deacons. The only exception to this rule was the church of Jerusalem, which, beside having the usual bench of presbyters and deacons, was presided

over by a single pastor of apostolical dignity—James the brother of our Lord. Every congregation, was to a certain extent independent, regulating its own affairs in its own way, at the same time, it regarded itself as a part of the great whole of regenerated humanity, as a member in particular of the one catholic church of Christ. Above the consciences of its members there was no one but the Lord Jesus himself who enlightened and guided them by his word and Spirit in all questions of truth and duty. Even the apostles (except as the instruments of the Spirit of revelation) never claimed to be lords over God's heritage. Nor can it be said that the whole power of government was lodged with them. We have an account of an apostolic election, and of an apostolic decree, and in both instances we are told that the whole body of professing Christians was present, not merely looking on, but co-operating and consenting.

*The Second Period* extends from the death of Paul, about A. D. 66, down to the calling of the Council of Nice. It begins with the second generation of the church, near the time of the destruction of Jerusalem. We now find in Ephesus and other great cities of proconsular Asia, in addition to the body of elders or congregational presbytery, a single pastor, (in the Apocalypse styled the Angel of the church) to whom the name of Bishop is specially applied. This was the first change in the form of government; it was indeed very slight, for it consisted in nothing more than giving to one of the presbyters that oversight of the congregation, which hitherto had been exercised by the presbytery or the elders conjointly. Both methods are apostolical and scriptural; and therefore in speaking of one of them as a departure from the original model, we do not mean to intimate that its introduction indicated any decline in the purity of the church nor do we believe that the prelacy of later times is in any proper sense the natural offspring of this primal, parochial, presbyterian episcopacy. These first bishops were not appointed to fill the place and preserve the succession of apostles; the two offices were entirely distinct; the apostle, as before stated, was an extraordinary minister of the church universal, while the bishop was simply the pastor of a local congregation, deriving from the former nothing but what had been already transferred to presbyters. As to rank and power he was still a simple presbyter. In fact the dogma of apostolical succession is a Jewish hea-

then heresy, and the enslavement of mind and conscience involved in it is palpably opposed to the express teachings of the Gospel.

Between A. D. 70 and 107, or from the destruction of Jerusalem down to the death of Ignatius, this episcopal system—as we are obliged to call it for the sake of distinction—gradually extended itself. In the early part of the 2d century it was generally, though by no means universally adopted, as appears from Clement's letter to the Corinthians. In the presbytery, the bishop was only *primus inter pares*; he was chosen by the people, ordained by presbyters; and in the exercise of government the elders and the congregation had a voice as potential as his own. That this was the scheme of government which generally obtained at this early period, is proved by the reliable records of its history which have survived the ravages of time. And with this account those writings which we recognise as the only genuine epistles of Ignatius exactly agree; while those which we reject as spurious exhibit a picture of the times entirely unlike that portrayed by every other witness whose testimony is admissible.

The difference between bishop and presbyter, at first imperceptible, gradually increased as the church grew in wealth and numbers, and declined in purity of faith and manners, until in the days of Cyprian of Carthage, and chiefly through his influence, it became very marked. It was claimed that bishops alone had authority to ordain; deacons began to be regarded as helpers of the bishop, rather than as servants of the congregation; they were viewed as members of the clerical order, between whom and the laity there at length came to be "a great gulf fixed." But this radical change in the constitution of the church was not effected without a struggle. The history of the times shows that, during the life of Cyprian, and long after his death a two-fold contest was carried; presbyters resisted the ambitious claims of bishops, and the people resisted the priestly pretensions of bishops, presbyters and deacons. The overthrow of Paganism, the accession of the might and majesty of the empire to the cause of the church, and her consequent union with the state, of necessity gave an immense impulse to the causes which, even in spite of repeated and terrible persecutions, had been long working a sad change in her constitution. She was



thoroughly reorganised, and prelacy became the order of the day. We are thus brought to

*The Third Period*, extending from the council of Nice to that of Trent, when the absolute power of the papacy and the priesthood obtained the positive sanction of ecclesiastical law, and assumed a form which can never be modified or amended, but must continue unchanged until the Lord comes to consume it with the spirit of his mouth.

We have thus given as fully as the limits of this article will permit, the arguments by which the able author of this volume sustains his position that the only genuine letters of Ignatius are those found in the Syriac translation, and that they are there given in their purest form. Some of the statements in regard to the early development of episcopacy are perhaps questionable; but his main point, that the genuine Ignatius is only to be found in the Syriac version, we believe he has triumphantly established. We feel sure that every candid reader, of whatever party, will agree with us in this opinion. There can be no longer any reasonable doubt as to what Ignatius wrote, and what he did not write; and if our prelatic friends really possess the veneration for the fathers of which they boast so much, they will no longer quote the worthless forgeries of one whose very name has sunk into oblivion, as if they were the genuine testimonies of the venerable pastor of Antioch.

---

#### ART. V.—*The Calcutta Review.*

THIS is a quarterly publication equal in size and not inferior in ability and interest to its compeers of Edinburgh and London. It was commenced May 1844. The advertisement prefixed to the first number states "that the object of the work is simply to bring together such useful information, and propagate such sound opinions, relating to Indian affairs, as will, it is hoped conduce, in some small measure, directly or indirectly, to the amelioration of the condition of the people." Its success exceeded the expectations of its projectors. Of many numbers a second and even a third edition has been published. For some

time the editorial supervision has been in the hands of Dr. Duff. The work is not designed to be religious, and the object of that distinguished missionary in devoting to it a portion of his valuable time, is to preserve it from any bias hostile to Christianity, and to direct its powerful influence, as far as allowable, to support of every measure which tends to promote the interests of the Redeemer's kingdom. Having recently received nearly a complete set of this Review, we have been looking through its pages with much interest. While thus employed our attention was arrested by an account, scattered through various numbers, of a people of whom we before had scarcely heard. These accounts we have extracted, persuaded they will interest our readers as much as they have us.

When early in 1836, the British first ascended the Ghats of Goomsur, the scene presented to their view was as grand as it was unexpected. It was in reality the discovery of a previously unknown and unexplored territory, a previously unknown and undescribed people. Beyond the mere fact of the existence of the hills, and of a wild people, called the KHONDS, who were said to inhabit them, little or nothing seemed to be antecedently known. "Goomsur is included in Orissa; which though now only a British province was anciently a great kingdom. In the year 1787, this country was invaded by the Mahrattas, who, as every where else, carried destruction and desolation in their train. But in the strange revolution of empires, in the year 1804, the country of Orissa fell under the sway of imperial Britain, and the last vestige of the Mahratta sovereignty was extinguished. Orissa is geographically divided into three districts, the maritime, subalpine, and alpine. The Khonds who inhabit this country, appear to be the descendants of the original inhabitants of India, and may be described as in a semi-barbarous state of society. Their government is patriarchal; and the tribes independent of each other, except that in war they are united against their enemies. They are of a good size, well formed, and athletic; but their dress is very scanty. The occasion which brought this people to the knowledge of the British was, the Goomsur war. Goomsur had long been one of the British tributaries; and the people of this province had long held certain relations to the Khonds, of which, until this time the British were entirely ignorant. In the prosecution of

this war the insurgents were pursued by the British troops into the Ghats, where the Khonds had their residence; and thus some knowledge of this hitherto unknown people was obtained. Various reports of the character, customs, and religious rites of this strange people have been given by different persons sent into their country; but the person who has given by far the most full and satisfactory account of them is Captain Macpherson; from whose several reports much of the information which we shall now attempt to communicate has been derived.

Their language, which contains many original words, has a mixture of the languages spoken in the plains. But, as they have no writings, and their pronunciation is deeply guttural, it has been found difficult precisely to ascertain its idioms and affinities.

Their social relations are rather loose and irregular; and the bond of marriage is very readily dissolved; but their manners are not in so degraded a state as among many savage nations. Mothers of children are much respected; and the women are consulted in all matters of importance.

In noticing this people, our main object is to furnish our readers with some account of a horrible practice, which from time immemorial has existed among them; and still exists, after all the efforts which have been made for its extirpation. It is the custom, at a certain season of the year, of offering up human victims to a certain goddess, with a view of obtaining good crops; for they entertain the persuasion, that unless they by this sacrifice appeased this deity, the earth would remain barren and produce nothing for the subsistence of man.

Before we proceed to give a particular account of this revolting rite of their religion, it may be proper to inform the reader, that female infanticide, so prevalent in several districts of Western India, is also extensively practised among the Khonds. Captain Macpherson informs us, that in some of the tribes, "The life of no female child is spared, unless it be a first-born; or when the head of a tribe wishes to form connections with some other tribe by intermarriages." The infants are destroyed by being exposed in the jungle ravines immediately after their birth; and he found many villages without a single female child.

Female infanticide has, however, no relation to their religion;

nor does it proceed, as in China, from the fear of starvation, but owes its origin to pride, or avarice. Marriage with them is neither with members of the same tribe, nor with foreigners, but between the different tribes of the same people; and fearing that advantageous matches for their daughters cannot be obtained, they take care to remove them out of the way. And as costly presents are expected from the father of the bride, it may be supposed, that avarice also may have an influence in keeping up this cruel custom.

We shall now give a particular account of their human sacrifices, which constitute an important part of the religion of this people:

"The earth-goddess being the principal divinity of the Khonds, her worship is that which engrosses the largest share of public attention. It is, moreover, that which in itself is most deeply fraught with tragic interest; inasmuch as its central point consists in the offering of human sacrifices. Of the origin of this sanguinary rite, the only reasonable tradition among the Khonds is the following: 'The earth,' say they, 'was originally a crude and unstable mass, unfit for cultivation, or for the convenient habitation of man. Then,' said the earth-goddess, 'let human blood be spilt upon me,' and a child was sacrificed. The soil became forthwith firm, and productive, and the deity ordained that man should repeat the rite and live. Human sacrifices to the earth-goddess are either *public* or *private*. Those intended for a tribe or village are considered necessary when any principal crop is put into the ground; and a harvest offering is nearly as indispensable as the spring sacrifice; and between these, according to the appearance of the year, several sacrifices are considered necessary. Again, should the health of the people be affected by prevalent disease, or other calamities be experienced, the earth-goddess must be appeased. Also, when any calamity befalls the head of the tribe, the occasion calls for a repetition of these sacrifices. Private sacrifices are made when any remarkable calamity is experienced by any family, if they are able to procure a human victim; otherwise, they bring a goat, whose ear is cut off, and cast bleeding on the earth—a pledge which must be redeemed with human blood, within the year. It will be evident, from what has been said, that the number of victims will be variable, in different



years, according to the circumstances mentioned: it is, however, commonly so great as to be appalling to the feelings of humanity. In one small valley, two miles long and three quarters broad, our author found seven victims, whose sacrifice was prevented only by the proximity of the British army, but which was to take place immediately after their departure.

"These unhappy victims are known in the Khond language under the designation of 'Merias.' They do not commonly consist of native Khonds, but are provided by a class of Hindu procurers, called 'Panwas,' who purchase them without difficulty upon false pretences, or kidnap them from the poorer classes of Hindus, in the low country. Their price is determined by the demand, varying from fifty to one hundred *lives*; that is, of living animals, sheep, goats, &c. A few are always kept in reserve, in each district, to meet sudden demands for atonement. Victims of either sex are equally acceptable to the earth-goddess; children, whose age precludes a knowledge of their condition, are preferred. In all cases the victim must be *bought with a price*—an unbought life being an abomination to the deity. The 'Meria' is brought to the village, or place where the sacrifice is to be made, blindfolded—and, if an adult, is confined with fetters; but if a child, is permitted freely to run about, and is welcomed at every threshold. In all cases they are received as *consecrated persons*. Sometimes they are permitted to grow from childhood to maturity, without any knowledge of their destiny. All arrangements connected with the ceremony of human sacrifices are conducted by the patriarch of the tribe or village, with the aid of the priest: the divine command is communicated by the latter, as he pretends to receive it in visions; and he may demand a victim, at any time, when no visible signs of divine displeasure are apparent. These sacrifices are generally attended by multitudes of people, as no one is excluded from being present. Persons of both sexes are indiscriminately allowed to be present, and the festival commonly lasts three days, during which all manner of licentiousness is prevalent. The first of these days is spent in feasting and obscene riot; on the second, the victim is washed and dressed in a new garment, and led forth to the 'Meria' grave, in a procession, accompanied with music and dancing. Hymns to the deity are also prepared and sung. The grave is in the midst

of a clump of trees in the vicinity of the village, near a stream of water. It is avoided by the Khonds, under the impression that it is haunted. In the midst of the trees, a stake is struck into the ground, at the foot of which the victim is seated, and fastened with his back to it. He is then anointed with oil, ghee and turmeric, and dressed with flowers; and during the day, a species of veneration is paid to the victim, which can scarcely be distinguished from worship. There is now a great struggle, especially with the women, to obtain the least relic of the victim, such as the turmeric with which he was anointed, and even his very spittle. On the third morning the victim is refreshed with a little milk and sago; when the licentious feast is renewed. The proper place for the sacrifice having been discovered the previous night, by piercing the ground with long sticks, in the dark, the first deep chink is considered as the spot which will be agreeable to the goddess. As the victim must not be bound when he suffers, and must not show any resistance, it is common to break the bones of the arms and of the legs, in several places. The priest, assisted by the elders of the village, now takes the branch of a green tree, which having split for several feet, they place the victim within the cleft. They wrap round it cords, by which the parts of the cleft tree are forced as near together as they can be made to come. The signal is now given, by the priest inflicting a slight wound with an axe, when, with maddening fury, the promiscuous crowd rush upon the victim with stunning shouts and pealing music, wildly exclaiming, 'We bought you with a price, and no sin rests on us.' They now tear his flesh to pieces from the bones. The horrid rite is now consummated, and every one returns with his bloody relics to his place; and for three days after the sacrifice, not a word is spoken, but all communication must be by signs; and no visits are received from strangers. At the termination of this period, a buffalo is sacrificed, after which their tongues are unloosed." The above is the description of this inhuman rite given by Captain Macpherson, but from the statements of others, there is reason to think, that the ceremonies accompanying these sacrifices, are considerably various, as practised by different tribes.

As Goomsur lies within the limits of the Madras government, Mr. Russell, their agent, made the first report to them

respecting the practice of offering up human sacrifices. He was of opinion that it would not be vain to attempt to put an end to the inhuman rite, by the application of force; for which he assigned several weighty reasons. He advised, however, that every effort should be made to rescue the victims, kept in reserve for sacrifice.

The Madras Government took up the subject seriously, and expressed regret that it was not practicable to put an end to the abominable custom at once; but adopting Mr. Russell's views, that the suppression of the practice must be by a slow process, they issued an order to the officer in command, in that district, to collect information on the subject—to endeavour to obtain as great an insight as he could into the feelings and opinions of the different classes of the people respecting it—to cultivate personal intercourse with the chiefs—and to exert his influence to convince them of the heinousness and folly of the practice—and to hold out every inducement, consistent with the public interest, to the Khonds, to enter as *Peons*, or otherwise, into the service of the Government. M. Arbuthnot, the officer then in authority in that region, upon inquiry, found that human sacrifices were offered, especially in the most inaccessible parts of the hill-country—and that the suppression of the revolting custom must be a work of difficulty and time.

As it was received by the Khonds as an important religious rite, it was evident, that it would not be proper to attempt to punish them for it as a crime, until pains were taken to enlighten them as to its iniquity; but as those who supplied the victims, by purchasing or kidnapping them, were not Khonds; and were not influenced by religious but mercenary motives, it was judged, that they ought to be considered the culprits, who might at once be subjected to punishment, as far as they could be detected. Accordingly, efforts were made to rescue the victims; and the first person who was successful in this work was Captain Millar, of the British regular army. He was so happy as to rescue from a cruel death no less than twenty-nine innocent persons. But it was found extremely difficult to convict any of those engaged in providing the victims, for want of that kind of evidence which the law required. Captain Millar, in his report, says, that the prevention of the practice by force, for a time, could not but have a beneficial effect. For, as the deluded

people labour under the persuasion, that unless these sacrifices were offered, the earth would produce nothing, and they would all perish for want of the means of subsistence, if they had the opportunity of observing that the crops were not ruined nor diminished, in consequence of the omission of these sacrifices, they would more readily be induced to give them up. And as these sacrifices are usually offered in the month of January, when the country is healthy, this would remove one great objection to the employment of a military force.

Captain Campbell, however, also an officer of the British army, in a letter of nearly the same date with that of Captain Millar, expresses very different opinions. He is opposed to any resort to coercion; and proposes the following plan: "I purpose," says he, "with your sanction," addressing himself to the Government, "to ascend the Ghats, with a considerable portion of the armed peons under my command, accompanied by fifty men of the seventeenth regiment, and call together the most influential men among the Khonds—endeavouring to convince them of the barbarity and inutility of the sacrifice, explaining to them our abhorrence and utter detestation of the practice; at the same time, ordering them to bring to me all the victims in their possession. And, if I cannot otherwise obtain them, I ask *permission* to purchase them at the prices they cost the Khonds; and at the same time, to use such threats, as I may think advisable to gain the object in view, both for the present and the future. If my efforts prove successful, I shall be able to deprive the parties engaged in the barbarous traffic of obtaining victims; who from the information I can gather are for the most part inhabitants of the low country; and thus gain the power of striking at one source of the evil by immediately securing the parties concerned."

On the 15th of January, 1832, the subject of these reports was taken up by the Madras Government; and the plan proposed by Captain Campbell was preferred; for, as to the supposed effect of seeing a district flourishing when no human victims were sacrificed, the experiment had been tried in the case of the district of *Degi*; but the example had been without effect. That part of Capt. Campbell's plan, however, which related to the purchase of the victims, was not adopted, as being peculiarly liable to abuse.



Capt. Campbell having received the permission which he requested, in January, 1838, proceeded into the country of the Khonds; and having called together the heads of the several tribes, he explained to them that the British government would no longer suffer the sacrifice of human victims among them. He then peremptorily ordered that they should bring all the "merias" in their possession to him. They, at first, denied that they had any such persons among them. But he had ascertained, beforehand, the names of several chiefs who had "merias" in their possession, and also from whom they had been purchased. Finding that they could not come at the truth, they delivered up *one hundred meriah children*. He then exacted from them a promise, that "meriah pujah" should henceforth be at an end. He concludes his report by saying, "I have every reason to believe, that the public performance of the Meriah Pujah in the Goomsur Maliahs is at an end."

It had before this time been believed, that the Khonds themselves were never sacrificed; but it was now satisfactorily ascertained, that all classes, whether Khonds, Hindus, Musselmans; whether old or young, male or female, might become the subjects of this sacrifice. Of course, however, when they could purchase victims from the plains, they preferred it to sacrificing their own people.

A serious question now arose, respecting the disposal of these devoted children. Mr. Russell with the views of a generous and enlightened statesman, recommended to the government, that they should be brought up and educated at the public expense. Captain Campbell ordered a building to be prepared for them, and proposed, that they should be brought up to labour and be furnished with necessary clothing.

In a report from Lieutenant Hill, the following information is given of the prevalence of the revolting custom of human sacrifices, in another district. "The information I obtained," says he, "regarding human sacrifices, leads me to believe, that the practice of that barbarous rite obtains to a far greater extent than is commonly supposed; and that the Khond Maliah of Goomsur forms but a very small portion of the country over which the custom prevails. One grand sacrifice said to have taken place, twelve years since, on occasion of the rajah of Bustar setting off to visit the rajah of Nagpore, is termed the *great sac-*

*ritice*; when, I understand, twenty-seven full grown men were immolated. I have good reason for thinking that in the tribe of Chinna Kimmedy alone, not less than two hundred children are kept for sacrifice! Upwards of one hundred, as is well known, have been given up, this year, in Goomsur; but many more still remain there. With these data to calculate from, it is fearful to contemplate the possible number of intended victims now in captivity among the Khonds."

Lieutenant Hill concludes his report with some very sensible and weighty remarks, respecting the best method of putting an end to this horrible practice. He thinks, considering the nature of the localities of these tribes, settled on and among the Ghats, and the little success which can attend persecution on account of religion, that it is very doubtful whether a resort to force is expedient. And yet when it is considered, that the exercise of coercion in the case of the THUGGS; an associated band of murderers, has been attended with the most salutary consequences; and that savage men can scarcely ever be induced to relinquish the most absurd sacred rites, received from their forefathers, there does appear a necessity for a military intervention, and this would not require a great force; a single company of regular troops, he is of opinion, would be sufficient to keep in awe any number of the Khonds.

Mr. Bannerman, the chief officer of Ganjam, under whose direction Lieut. Hill had acted, now determined to go into the country of the Khonds himself, about the time when human sacrifices were usually offered. The government approved of his purpose, and supplied him with four elephants and a guard, and all other things requisite to facilitate his journey. Of this visit he has furnished an interesting narrative; from which we extract the following particulars. He informs us, that he arrived at a certain village, where a victim was about to be offered, before the inhabitants had any knowledge of his approach. "The preparations for the ceremony appeared to have been completed. The entrance into the hamlet,—which was in the form of a square,—had been newly fitted up with wicker works, and in the centre close to the rude village idol, had been erected a bamboo pole about forty feet high, on the top of which was an effigy in the shape of a bird, with peacock's feathers." The Khonds immediately fled, but after some demur

the victim was given up to him, a young woman from the plains of Chinna Kimmedy. After a while, some of the elders and chiefs were induced to approach and communicate with him. To the arguments alleged to show the heinous nature of the crime of putting a fellow creature to death, for the folly of supposing that any good could accrue from such a sacrifice, the answer was, that they were not tributary to us, and had a right to observe a custom which had been handed down in their nation from time immemorial, and which, if neglected, would cause the earth to be entirely unproductive; that the victims had been fairly purchased with a price, and that they did not wish to have their right to do as they pleased, in this case, interfered with. Mr. Bannerman finding argument unavailing against the ignorance and strong prejudices of this people, thought it prudent to retrace his steps; but for his own security, he kept several of the chiefs as hostages, that through their influence he might be enabled to rescue other victims who might be in the neighboring villages. Accordingly, he succeeded in obtaining nine "Merias," who were intended for sacrifice, in the surrounding country.

Mr. Bannerman proposes to the Government the sending a detachment of troops through the country, about the time of celebrating the *Tanki* sacrifice; not with a view to coerce the inhabitants, but he is persuaded that the presence of such a detachment in the country would prevent these cruel sacrifices. "It is fearful," says he, "to contemplate the extent of human misery resulting from the practice of this execrable rite; for, independent of the number of Merias annually sacrificed—and there is reason to believe the number far greater than could readily be credited—it gives rise, with all its attendant evils, to kidnapping the unfortunate inhabitants of the plain, who are decoyed into the hills by a set of infamous wretches, who carry on a profitable traffic in the blood of their fellow men. The agents engaged in these odious dealings are, for the most part, of the Panwa, or Dobango, or other base tribes, through whom the intercourse with the low country is chiefly carried on; and who, without remorse, barter their unhappy captives for saffron, wax, and other products of the hills. The guilt of these heartless miscreants appears to be even of a deeper die than that of the African slave-traders; and their motives are of the most

base and sordid kind; so that their infamous conduct does not admit of any palliation. The barbarous and ignorant Khonds, on the other hand, are conscious of no crime in performing what they regard as a sacred duty, in celebrating the *Tanki* festival. The perversion of the human intellect, that can regard the cruel death of a fellow creature as a sacrifice acceptable in the sight of the Deity, is indeed strange. The agents, through whose means the Khonds are supplied with these victims, are the proper objects of condign punishment. But from the circumstances of the case, it has been found almost impossible to obtain legal evidence against these guilty culprits."

The Government were well pleased with the course pursued by Mr. Bannerman, and thought it much to his credit, that he had succeeded in rescuing nine victims from a cruel death, without coercion, and without involving the country in any collision with these tribes. And they entered fully into his plan of sending a detachment of troops into the country, to overawe the inhabitants, and to prevent the cruel sacrifices offered by them.

Captain Campbell, who contemporaneously with Mr. Bannerman, had visited another portion of the country of the Khonds, says, that he obtained certain information but of eleven instances of the sacrifice of Merias among the tribes which he visited; and these they pretended had died a natural death. The chiefs came forward with a request, that they might be permitted to offer one sacrifice for each tribe, every year; but did not seem to be much disappointed at receiving a refusal. He asked the opinion of their rulers, called Bisayes, who, though they have been brought up among the Khonds, are not of them; and who entertain a great abhorrence of this abominable custom. Their judgment was, that a proclamation of Government, forbidding the practice on severe penalties, would be effectual. And Captain Campbell gives it as his own opinion, "that unless we address ourselves to their fears, as well as their better feelings, our steps for the suppression of the '*Meria Pujah*,' will be slow indeed, and perhaps wholly nugatory." For two years nothing more was done, when Major Campbell again entered the country of the Khonds, with the view of preventing the celebration of the *Tanki* festival. He found that twenty-four victims had been sold to them within the last twelve months. Six of these were delivered to him; and he



secured two or three of the guilty agents who supplied these victims, against whom he expected to obtain such evidence as would be sufficient to effect their condemnation.

Lieutenant Hill, in a report to Mr. Bannerman, represented the southern tribes as being in a state of great excitement; so that he considered it inexpedient, while among them, to allude to the subject. From credible sources of information, he learned that parents had been known to sell their children, not only to the Panwas, but to the Khonds themselves; and that the price at which they were valued, was no more than four or five rupees, by the head. And from data, in his possession, Lieut. Hill calculated that the number of victims sacrificed in the forty *Mutahs*, or villages of the Khonds, in one year, could not be fewer than two hundred and forty!

The subject engaged not only the attention of the Government of Madras, but the Governor General with his Council, was deeply interested in the plans proposed for the eradication of this execrable rite; but all seemed to be convinced that it would require much time and patient effort, to eradicate an evil so inveterate, and believed by the people to be so essential to their very existence.

The object was never lost sight of by the agents of Government; but though the sacrifice of human beings was not so public as formerly, yet there was too much evidence that the practice was not abandoned.

For six years not much was heard respecting this matter. About this time a new actor appeared in opposition to the Merias, Colonel Ouseley, agent of the Governor General. In 1844, he succeeded in rescuing two lads, and restored them to their friends. He obtained information, that on some occasions, when they could not obtain Merias, they gave up their aged fathers and mothers for sacrifice. And that to escape detection from the Government, they at once killed and buried the Merias. The feelings of the Colonel were much excited by the information received; and he determined to march into the midst of the country of the Khonds, as being fully persuaded that nothing but intimidation would produce any effect, to prevent the continuance of the revolting sacrifice. He was for marching a large body of dragoons and infantry, and inflicting condign punishment on all who were engaged in these shameful

sacrifices. The Colonel, in a subsequent report, mentioned a chief who would be happy to enter the country, and who could soon point out hundreds of these poor Merias. That these sacrificial rites were common, he knew, from personally conversing with the people on the borders—not only the chiefs, but the poorer classes. He said that he was fully aware that many obstacles would be placed in the way of all inquiries, and that opposition would be made by the Zemindars, to every step taken to put down the practice; nevertheless, he believed, that in one season, either by conciliation or force, he would be able to subdue those who made resistance to his plans. He was persuaded that without force nothing effectual could be done. Of the same opinion was Lieutenant Hicks; but he shows, in his judicious report, the great difficulties which surrounded the subject. “The destitution and poverty of the Khonds,” he observes, “is very great. They are possessed of little or no property; and on the approach of our troops would fly to their fastnesses, where it would be in vain to pursue them. And I am persuaded,” says he, “that three-fourths of the Khonds would offer a mad and blind resistance to our demands, under the idea that they were merely fighting for their country, independence and tribe. It, therefore, seems probable, that a coercive undertaking, to be effective, must be a protracted one; and this is the strong objection to the application of force, until all other measures have failed; for troops detained in the country would prevent the cultivation of the lands, and keep the people shut up in their fastnesses. To this should be added the notorious insalubrity of the climate, which would prove more destructive than the sword of the enemy.”

Upon the energetic representation of Mr. Mills to the Government, Lieutenant Hicks was appointed his assistant, and was deputed by him to go into the country of the Khonds, to obtain information on several points; and to ascertain from an actual survey of the state of affairs what would be the wisest plan of proceeding, effectually to suppress the deplorable evil which was so inveterate. Lieutenant Hicks was unable to set off on his mission at the best season of the year, to be in that unhealthy country. However, he went, and was successful, not only in obtaining much useful information, but in rescuing twenty-five intended victims from a cruel death. He also had

influence to induce twenty-six of the Khond Sindars, or Chiefs, to enter into a written engagement to abstain from the horrid rites practised by their respective tribes. Moreover, a kidnapper, or dealer in stolen children, was arrested, and sent to the proper tribunal, for trial. Still, the joy at this partial success was tempered by the consideration, that all the *Merias* were not given up; and that all the Sindars had not entered into the engagement mentioned; and what was more discouraging, there was much reason to fear, that those who had given their pledge would not be faithful in keeping their engagements. He himself mentions one remarkable case, in which a certain Sindar promised Mr. Ricketts that he would relinquish the rite and do all in his power to dissuade the people from sacrificing human victims. Upon which Mr. Ricketts presented him with a horse, some money, and other articles; but no sooner had this man reached his home, than he sacrificed several unfortunate victims.

To all arguments employed by Mr. Hicks, to show the enormity of the evil, and how strongly it was reprobated by the Government, the only answer was, that the "sacrifice was a ceremony practised by their progenitors." After the fullest examination, and after using every conciliatory effort and argument, Mr. Hicks concludes, by saying, "I am firmly convinced, in my own mind, that, sooner or later, force must be resorted to, as no other motives than those of a coercive nature, will effectually check its continuance."

Mr. Mills, in forwarding Lieutenant Hicks's report, passed a very high eulogium on his assistant; whose conduct met also with the full approbation of the Government.

In the year 1845, Mr. Hicks was again sent with an armed force into the country of the Khonds. He assembled their chiefs, and again represented to them the strong displeasure of the Government to this inhuman rite; but they denied that it was now practised by their people; and he failed of getting into his hands any of the victims; which, however, he still believed were concealed among them.

All the attempts to suppress the inhuman rite of the *Meria* sacrifice having been frustrated, the Government determined to appoint a suitable person to go into the country, not in a hostile manner, but for the benevolent purpose of promoting trade

between the several tribes, and also between the ghats and the low country; and who should have it as an object to obtain information respecting the facts in regard to this practice, and to suggest and carry into effect prudent measures for its abolition. For this important mission, Captain Macpherson, who made the first report respecting the offering of human sacrifices, was selected; and a man in all respects better qualified could not have been found. He was fully persuaded that all attempts to suppress the rite by force would be ineffectual; and that it could only be accomplished gradually, and by slow degrees. Captain Macpherson took up his residence in the country of the Khonds, accompanied by such a military force as was thought necessary. But soon disease invaded his camp, and carried off a large number of his men; and very few of them escaped the diseases of this deleterious climate.

Our limits do not admit of our exhibiting the plan of Captain Macpherson in detail; but his object was to begin at the foundation of their social system, and to improve the mode of administering justice, which, he observed, was very imperfect among these tribes. His views and sentiments respecting the best method of removing not only this revolting rite, but many other evils, appear to be wise and practicable, and have met with the entire approbation of the Government, and all judicious persons. But as his well devised plan of operation has been, for the present, frustrated by the deleterious character of the climate; and as a considerable time will be required to test the efficacy of the measures which may be adopted, it will be unnecessary, at present, to enter into any further details respecting his operations. In justice, however, to Captain Macpherson, it is proper to remark, that justice and humanity characterised all his measures. And finding his powers too limited, he took a journey to Calcutta, to get them enlarged. One of his measures, which is an evidence of his wisdom, was, to introduce education among the savage tribes; as believing that the inhuman superstitions of the people could never be radically removed, in any other way. We are only surprised to find nothing said in all these reports respecting the efficacy of the gospel, above all other means, to cure evils of this kind.

It has already been noticed that female infanticide is customary among the Khonds, but practised on principles entirely



different from those which govern the *Meria* sacrifice. Pride and avarice seem to be the sources of this deplorable evil: it has no respect, as was before observed, to religion. It was also mentioned, that the same practice is prevalent, to an alarming degree, in several districts of Rajahputana, in Western India.

Before closing this article, we judge it expedient to bring to view some of the facts which have been fully ascertained, in relation to this inhuman custom. These are derived from an interesting article in the second number of the *Calcutta Review*.

In 1800, Mr. Duncan, then Governor of Bombay, learned that in a certain tribe of Rajputs, "the birth of a daughter was considered disgraceful—that new-born daughters were accordingly put to death." Again, in 1804, he incidentally learned from a conversation with a daughter of one of the princes of Gujurat, "that in Corsti of Jahriga Rajputs they did not bring up their daughters, but put them to death at their birth," and this was the established practice.

These disclosures had such an influence on the benevolent mind of Mr. Duncan, that he was led to institute further inquiries in regard to this matter; and prosecuting his inquiries, he had the happiness to find an able coadjutor, in that distinguished philanthropist, Colonel Walker. "In 1808, he commenced his inquiries with a vigour, an energy, and an earnestness as untiring in the pursuit, as they were successful in the issue. This investigation opened up views of the extent of the criminal practice of a startling and appalling magnitude." It was found that in the tribe, before mentioned, the practice was general. There might be seven or eight families who preserved alive their daughters; but as a general thing, they were put to death as soon as born; and not in this tribe only, but through the whole province of Gujarat. And it was ascertained, that in the few cases in which they were preserved, the motive was not parental affection, but some superstitious notion connected with the doctrine of metempsychosis which made them averse to taking away the life of any animal.

Colonel Walker, in the absence of a census, was unable to ascertain the number of infants destroyed in one year, in this single tribe; but according to the report of natives best acquainted with the country, the number of families amounted to 125,000, and the number of female infants put to death in one

year to 20,000. This number he thought to be greatly exaggerated, but supposing the number to be only one-half of this, what a waste of human life, if we take into view the fact, that the practice has prevailed from time immemorial!

The information given to the public by Colonel Walker, on this melancholy subject, had nearly fallen into oblivion, when Mr. Wilkinson laid open the full extent of the evil. As several persons, among the rest Sir J. Malcom, had published the opinion, that the practice of infanticide had in a great measure, ceased, except in the families of the rajahs, Mr. Wilkinson determined to make a thorough investigation into the facts of the case. And he instituted a careful inquiry into the proportion of males and females in a number of tribes; and the result is truly appalling. In one tribe the proportion was 113 to 16; in a second, 240 to 96; in a third, 131 to 61; in a fourth, 14 to 4; in a fifth, 39 to 7; in a sixth, 20 to 7; in a seventh, 70 to 32. Now, it is known that the number of males and females born, is nearly equal; it will follow from a comparison of the foregoing numbers, that at least 77 per cent. of all the females born are destroyed; for the aggregate proportion of the sexes in the tribes referred to is 632 males to 225 females, or in round numbers *two-thirds* destroyed, and one-third preserved alive!

Nor was the practice confined solely to the Rajputs: Mr. Wilkinson ascertained that a chief among the Sikhs had destroyed all his daughters; and that the Minas, a savage tribe who inhabited the mountains, were addicted to the horrid practice. Of eleven of their villages he obtained an accurate census; from which it appeared that the number of males was 369 and of the females, according to this census, 82; or more than three-fourths of the whole must have been destroyed. In one village, there were only 4 girls to 44 boys; in another, 4 girls to 58 boys; and in a third, with a large number of boys, *no girls at all*;—the inhabitants freely confessing that *they had destroyed every girl born in the village*.

We have seen the extent of this appalling practice of female infanticide, it is a natural inquiry in what way it is carried into effect, commonly, it is said, by starvation. When a daughter is born, there is no greeting or rejoicing; often the child is killed before its father is made acquainted with its birth.

Sometimes, he issues an order for the destruction of the infant; but if he is silent, it is inferred that he wishes it done. Women of rank have their servants to whom the perpetration of the criminal act is committed. But the parents appear to have no conscience of any crime: they give no evidence of the least feeling of remorse. It may be asked, whether the mothers have no natural affection for their offspring, which is so manifest even in brutes? Often, it is said, they do intercede for the preservation of their female offspring, and when spared, they manifest as strong parental feelings as other people; but the fact is, *that gross and perverted notions of religion* possess a power over superstitious minds, to suppress or counteract the strongest feeling of natural affection.

Our object in collecting and exhibiting the above facts, is not merely to gratify curiosity, by making known the customs of people now living upon earth; but, chiefly, with the view of showing the deep depravity and wretched degradation of our fallen nature, when left to its own evil devices and corrupt imaginations. The vain theories and false statements of a certain school of philosophers respecting the innocence of human nature, when left to itself, and uncorrupted by the vices of civilization, are refuted by every accurate history of any savage people; and their vices and moral degradation far exceed all our previous conceptions. The further our inquiries are extended, the more wretched and abominable does man appear.

And finally, we present these facts to the Christian public, and ask every reader of every condition, whether there is not a solemn obligation resting on every one to make greater exertions than ever to rescue his miserable fellow-creatures from the deplorable condition in which they are sunk. And if it be inquired, what can we do, the answer is, send them the gospel. Send them the living preacher. Establish among them schools of Christian learning. Give more liberally of your substance to promote this object; and pray more earnestly for the conversion of the world.

ART. VI.—*The General Assembly.*

THE General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America met, agreeably to appointment, in the First Presbyterian Church in the city of Pittsburgh, May 17th, 1849, and was opened with a sermon by the Rev. Alexander T. McGill, D. D., moderator of the previous Assembly, on Ps. lxxxvii. 7; "All my springs are in Thee."

The Rev. Nicholas Murray, D. D., of Elizabethtown, New Jersey, was unanimously chosen moderator, and the Rev. W. W. Hill, temporary clerk.

*Church Music.*

The Rev. Dr. Plumer presented the report of the committee appointed by the preceding Assembly on church music. This report contained an account of the labours of the committee, and of the progress which they had made in the prosecution of the work assigned them. It concluded with the following recommendation, viz:

"The Committee respectfully suggest to the General Assembly, that their Report and the Appendix be referred to a special Committee of their body, for examination, and if thereupon the Assembly should approve and encourage the further prosecution of their work, on the basis of the principles therein set forth, that authority be given to this Committee, as in the case of the Book of Psalms and Hymns (see the minutes of the General Assembly, A. D. 1842, page 44 and 45), to complete the work, and make the necessary arrangements for its publication and circulation, among our churches.

"The Report was followed by an Appendix, containing a list of the tunes recommended to be published by the General Assembly for the use of the Church."

The committee to whom this matter was referred subsequently presented the following report, viz:

"The Special Committee to whom was referred for examination the Report and Appendix of the Committee of last year, on Church Music, now respectfully report—

"That they find in the papers submitted, evidences of ability, industry, and progress, which designate that Committee as



the proper agents to carry out the object proposed, namely, to furnish a book of tunes adapted to our present psalmody, published in a convenient form or for general use in our churches. They therefore recommend the adoption of the following minute:

"1. *Resolved*, That said Committee on Church Music be continued, and, they are hereby authorized to go on at their discretion to revise, change, or enlarge, and complete the present selection of tunes submitted in the Appendix to their Report; to employ at all necessary expense, the proper professional skill to arrange the harmonies, and adapt the music to our psalmody, and to complete and print the book, through the Board of Publication. And the book so printed shall be laid before the next General Assembly.

"2. *Resolved*, That as the original Committee are now in progress, our ministers and members individually, and the Presbyteries, be still invited as before to communicate freely with said Committee, and make such suggestions as may aid in the completion of a book which may, as far as possible, be adapted to the widest and most approved use in our churches—that these suggestions be expressed, post-paid, before the first day of December next, to the chairman, the Rev. John M. Krebs, D. D., New York, and the Committee shall not put the book to press before that time.

"After some desultory discussion, it was on motion of Dr. Spring,

"*Resolved*, That the Committee be not required to submit the proof sheets of the book to the Presbyteries before publishing.

"The report was then adopted."

#### *A Common Paper for the Boards.*

The Rev. Dr. Plumer offered the following resolution, viz:

"*Resolved*, That a Committee of seven be appointed, for the purpose of devising, if possible, some arrangements by which a monthly, or weekly periodical, giving important information respecting the Boards of our Church, and sustaining the cause of each of them, should be published, and that the Secretaries of said Boards be requested to lay before the said Committee so much of their respective reports as relates to periodicals, and

to give such other information on the subject as may be in their possession."

This matter was referred to Rev. J. W. Alexander, J. Krebs, I. S. Prime, C. Van Rensselaer, H. Boardman, T. L. Janeway, and Messrs. Walter Lowrie, and W. S. Martien, as a committee to report to the next Assembly.

### *Christian Union.*

A committee had been appointed by a preceding Assembly to confer with delegates from various other Presbyterian bodies in this country, on the best means of promoting Christian union. Dr. Phillips, as chairman of that committee, presented the following preamble and resolutions, which had been adopted by the delegates above mentioned, when met in conference.

"WHEREAS, The Church of Jesus Christ constitutes one body, of which He is the Divine Head, and consequently should be so organized as to exhibit to the view of the world the appearance, as well as the reality of unity; and whereas the present divided condition of the Church is in appearance at least, inconsistent with her unity; therefore,

"*Resolved*, 1. That it is the imperative duty of the followers of Christ to aim at bringing about a union of all the different portions of the household of faith upon a scriptural basis.

"*Resolved*, 2. That in the judgment of this convention, it is not only desirable, but practicable, to effect a closer union than that which now exists among the bodies which are here represented, whereby they might more successfully accomplish the great work for which the church was established.

"And whereas, the views of the great system of evangelical truth, as exhibited in the standards of these different churches, namely, in the Westminster Confession and Catechism, the Articles of the Synod of Dordrecht, and in the Heidelberg Catechism, are substantially the same; therefore,

"*Resolved*, 3. That it is the duty of these churches to cultivate towards each other the spirit of fraternal affection, to exercise Christian forbearance, and to co-operate in all scriptural efforts to promote the common Christianity.

"*Resolved*, 4. That in the judgment of this convention, while the singing of God's praise is an interesting part of religious

worship, and while, for the present, it is left to the different churches to employ whichever of the authorized versions now in use may be most acceptable to them, the sacred songs contained in the book of Psalms are every way suitable and proper for that purpose, and any intimation that they breathe a spirit inconsistent with the gospel, is to be regarded as a reflexion upon their divine Author.

*“Resolved, 5.* That where it is practicable, without any surrender of principle, an interchange of ministerial services be recommended, and that the different churches pay respect to each other's acts of discipline, and sustain each other in all scriptural efforts to promote the good order and to preserve the purity of the church.

*“Resolved, 6.* That in the prosecution of the work of missions, it is desirable that these different churches, as far as practicable, should act in concert, the missionaries, in the exercise of their ministry being accountable to the particular body with which they are ecclesiastically connected.

*“Resolved, 7.* That for the promotion of a better understanding and more intimate intercourse between these different churches, it is desirable that a correspondence be maintained, either by letter or by delegation, as may be judged most expedient.

*“Resolved, 8.* That these resolutions be recommended to the consideration of the different churches represented in this convention, that they may report their judgment in the premises, to a future convention to be held in the city of Albany, on the first day of November next, at eleven o'clock, A. M.”

On motion of Mr. Nevin, this report was accepted and referred to a committee, who subsequently reported the following resolutions, which were adopted.

“The committee appointed to examine the proceedings of the conference composed of ministers of different Presbyterian bodies which met in April last, to consider the subject of Christian Union, present the following resolutions to the consideration of this Assembly:

“1. Resolved, That the subject of Christian Union, among all those who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, taking him as their Prophet, Priest, and King, is one of increasing importance in this age, and one which should be prayerfully

and zealously prosecuted until the various branches of the Church of Christ become one in appearance and action, as they are now one in spirit.

"2. Resolved, That while we do not undertake to examine the resolutions of the Conference so critically as to be able either to approve or condemn every form of expression used therein; nevertheless, we do most cordially approve of the spirit and aim of all their proceedings; and rejoice moreover at the unanimity with which the representatives of so many branches of the Church, arrived at their generally just and valuable conclusions.

"3. Resolved, That the former committee of the Assembly, with such additional members as may be now appointed, be continued; and they are hereby authorized to meet and act in such future conferences as may assemble to promote this important object; of which action they shall make a report to the next General Assembly."

The only thing which elicited any debate in reference to this matter was the fourth resolution adopted by the Conference, which declares that "the sacred songs contained in the book of Psalms, are every way suitable and proper for that purpose, [viz., singing the praises of God,] and any intimation that they breathe a spirit inconsistent with the gospel, is to be regarded as a reflexion on their divine author." Some of the members thought that this language implied that the book of Psalms was of itself all the church needs, or indeed should use in singing the praises of God. Others, on the other hand, understood the resolution as expressing simply these two ideas: first, that it is right to use the book of Psalms in the worship of God, the sacred songs which it contains being suitable for that purpose. And secondly, that the spirit which they breathe is not inconsistent with the gospel. On these points, it is presumed, all Christian men are agreed. It was with this understanding the resolutions were adopted.

#### *The American Bible Society.*

The Rev. Mr. Prime, one of the Secretaries of the American Bible Society, on motion of the Rev. Dr. Phillips, was heard before the Assembly in reference to the plans and operations of that important institution. In the course of his interesting address, he stated the following facts. During the last year



six hundred thousand copies of the scriptures had been distributed by the Society. The destitution in some parts of the country, however, was still lamentably great. A delegation from Ireland represented that if an hundred thousand copies of the scriptures could be furnished, they could be immediately placed in the hands of Roman Catholic readers. In answer to this demand the Society furnished as large a supply as could be spared, which "is now on the ocean carrying the bread of life to that spiritually starving population." Ten thousand dollars have been sent to France, which have been employed in printing the gospels and Acts which are used as school books. In Italy the bible has been smuggled over the Alps, and a Bible Society is now established in Florence. The Society is engaged to furnish means to print the bible in Turkey, Syria, and India. The resources of the Society are inadequate to the extent of the demand. Some agents state, that not more than two in five of the churches within their field, contribute to this object; others say one in five; others, one-half.

Dr. Plumer then moved the adoption of the following minutes, viz.:

"The General Assembly, impressed with a deep sense of the infinite value of the Holy Scriptures, and the importance of their prayerful and diligent study in the family; recognizing the right of every man to read the word of God for himself, and consequently regarding the obligation as imperative and perfect, to send the bible to those who are destitute: beholding with grateful astonishment, the whole world suddenly and completely thrown open for the circulation of the scriptures, obstacles having been recently and marvellously removed, so that the word of God has free course among all the nations of the earth: having heard with painful emotions that there are hundreds of thousands of families in our beloved country without a bible, in some of the old States one family in every ten, and in other States one in five being actually destitute, while Ireland, France, Italy, Austria, and other Roman Catholic countries, are sending to this land for bibles, and multitudes are flocking daily to our shores from foreign lands, who ought to be supplied with the bread of life; that our missionaries are asking and receiving aid from the American Bible Society, to enable them to print the bible for the heathen, among whom

our missionaries are labouring: that in Turkey, Syria, Persia, India, China, and other distant parts of the world, the bible is in process of publication, and its circulation among the Mohamedans, Armenians, and Pagans, is restricted only by the want of means to prepare and spread it; therefore,

“Resolved, That the General Assembly earnestly recommends to the churches under its care, to use all diligence to supply the destitute in their vicinity with the Holy Bible, and to contribute annually, according to their respective ability, to aid the American Bible Society in its noble exertions to give the word of God to the whole world.”

This motion gave rise to a somewhat protracted discussion, which related principally to two points: the distribution of the scriptures among slaves, and the extent of the actual destitution of the word of God. In reference to the former point, Dr. Plummer said, “I hold in my hand the thirty-second report of the Bible Society. On p. 135 there is a good list of contributions to the slaves, amounting to near \$1,000. The Society lately received a communication asking for bibles for slaves in Florida, and I never heard of these demands being refused. On p. 61 I find an account of the distribution of the bible among coloured persons and slaves, and I will read part of the report to show the union of feeling among those who have the good of their fellow men at heart.”

Rev. Mr. Gildersleeve said: “I am now, and have been for twenty years, a manager of the Charleson Bible Society, and I have personally given to every slave that came in my way a copy of the scriptures. It is the unanimous feeling of all the members of that Society to give the bible to all slaves in that region of the country.”

It is gratifying to know that there was not on the floor of the Assembly, and probably is not a minister in our church who does not heartily unite in the recognition of “the right of every man to read the word of God for himself.” If this right exists, then the obligation is undeniable to teach all men to read, and to give them the means of access to the words of eternal life, which are addressed to bond and free, wise and unwise. On these points of Christian duty there is, we trust, no diversity of opinion in the Presbyterian church.

*Board of Foreign Missions.*

The following is a brief abstract of the report of this Board, as presented to the Assembly.

"Receipts of the year, \$110,081—being greater than in any former year.

"Expenditures, \$110,207.

"Publications—Missionary Chronicle, 8,150; Foreign Missionary, 14,750; Annual Report, 7,850; Letters to Children and to Sabbath Schools, 12,000.

"New Missionaries, 21—of whom five are ordained ministers, two licentiates, one physician, and one printer.

"Among Choctaw, Chickesaw, Creek, Seminole, Iowa, Otoe, Omaha, and Chippewa Indians, eight ministers of the gospel, one physician, one native licentiate preacher, five male and five female teachers, one farmer, one carpenter, and the wives of the missionaries; about three hundred scholars, of whom two hundred are in boarding schools; sixty-three native preachers reported in connection with the churches.

"In West Africa, three ministers of the gospel and two teachers; schools at three of the stations; church at Monrovia.

"In North India, three missions—the Lodiana, Ferrukhabad, and Allahabad, with nine stations; twenty-five ministers of the gospel, one of them a native, and most of them married; and seventeen native converts employed as catechists and teachers; two printing-presses, with book-binderries, and fonts of type in four languages, from which upwards of 10,000,000 pages of the Holy Scriptures and religious tracts were sent forth during the year ending November 1, 1848; scholars about 1200—of whom 150 are supported by the missions, and about 600 more are in schools of a high order; churches at several stations, and 112 native church members reported.

"In Siam, two ministers of the gospel, both of them married, and a physician.

"In China, three missions, one of them unoccupied at present; nine ministers of the gospel, one physician, one superintendent of the press; about one hundred scholars—of whom sixty are supported by the missions; church at Ningpo; printing press, with moveable metallic types, from which about 4,000,000 pages of the Sacred Scriptures and religious tracts were issued.

"Among the Jews, two ministers of the gospel.

"In Papal Europe, efforts made to promote the spread of the gospel, by sending moneys to approved persons in France and Geneva, to be expended for that purpose.

"*Summary.*—Missions in seven general fields of labor, viz: the Indian tribes, Africa, India, Siam, China, Europe, and the Jews; ministers of the gospel, forty-nine; physicians, three; licentiate preachers, two; male and female teachers, twelve; carpenter, farmer, &c., four; native Christian teachers and catechists, not fully reported; schools at most of the stations; eleven churches; printing presses at four stations; the returns of the European missions not included.

"While so much has been accomplished—and during the last year more than twice as much money contributed to the cause as was given ten years ago—yet it was painful to find so many churches and so many Christians neglecting the missionary work. 'The Board, however, was in a prosperous state; they had no debts to embarrass them; there had been no diversion of funds from other objects; the advance that had been made was not at the expense of other institutions in the church; and we were called to go forward in this work of the Lord. The medical skill and experience of Christian physicians, are doing much for Christianity. Missions are established among the Jews, the mind of that people being at present very unsettled on religious subjects."

It is doubtless a very common impression that it is strange the amount contributed to the Foreign Board is greater than that which is contributed to the Board of Domestic Missions. People ask why should more be given to send the gospel abroad, than to propagate and sustain it at home? Mr. Lowrie, when presenting the report of the Board of Foreign Missions, adverted to this subject, and very clearly pointed out the oversight on which this impression is founded. There is probably twenty times as much money contributed in our church for the support of the gospel at home as is given to send it to the millions of perishing heathen. Think of what is annually paid in the erection of churches, in the salaries of ministers, in the distribution of religious publications and of the sacred scriptures, and in the numerous other enterprises which have for their object the extension and support of religion among our own people. How



small a pittance, compared with the aggregate of these contributions, is the amount devoted to all these objects in the foreign field. The comparison is often inconsiderately made between the sums received by the two Boards, foreign and domestic, and because the former receives the larger sum, it is inferred that more is done for foreign than for domestic missions. It is, however, forgotten that the Board of Domestic Missions does nothing but contribute a certain sum towards the salary of those whom it commissions; whereas the Foreign Board is charged with the entire support of its missionaries, and besides this has to print and distribute tracts, religious books and copies of the sacred scriptures, to sustain boarding and day schools, academies or colleges, to erect buildings, and to provide all the apparatus of every kind necessary for the complicated work of establishing the church among the heathen. All these sources of expense are in this country met by other means than by drafts on the funds of the Domestic Board. It is a great mistake, therefore, to suppose that the church is doing more for the heathen than for our own land. It is probably not doing one twentieth part so much. This is no proof that we are doing too much for the Domestic Board, but it is a proof that we are doing too little for foreign missions.

Mr. Lowrie introduced to the Assembly a chief of the Iowa tribe of Indians, who addressed the house through the Rev. Mr. Irwin, who acted as his interpreter. Mr. Irwin was then himself heard, of whose address we give the report as printed in the Presbyterian.

*Address of Mr. Irwin.*—"As this is a subject of great interest to us, I will make a statement of facts, which may assist you in the conclusions to which you may come.

"It has been my privilege to be a servant of the church for twelve years among the western Indians, during which time I have had full opportunity of knowing the condition of the station.

"There is nothing which causes so much hindrance as the little help at our stations. I will give you a few facts. We have at our stations, including the missionaries' children, fifty of a family, and for that family we have but two girls to help us in the kitchen; and the Corresponding Secretary tells me we are better provided for than other stations. Our wives often

become sick, and we become sick also, and have to attend to the kitchen ourselves. It is no disgrace to tell you that I have stood over the wash tub many a day; I have gone into the kitchen and cooked in the best way I could.

"You do not know these things. You want ministers and missionaries, and educated men; but there is a disposition to overlook these little matters; and let me tell you, the great matters are made up of the little matters. We want help of this kind more than we want help of any other description; and by sending us such help as girls for the kitchen and stewards, you just send the help we want; and you give the missionaries an opportunity to do their proper work. You do not want your missionaries to go into the kitchen. It is work that can be done by others; and it would be economical to send out pious families and pious men of limited means and capacities, in whom is the spirit and disposition of Christ. They will leave us time to teach the children and preach among the Indians, and travel among them, and tell them the way of life.

"We labour under great embarrassment. We live on the margin of a slave state; and we could procure assistance from the coloured people, but if it were our disposition to hire these, the slave holders have no disposition to let them come to us, for fear of losing them. The lower class of families are very poor help, and they are of that kind as to render scarcely any assistance at all; and we want you to go home and inquire among the people for those that will labour—not gentlemen and ladies who do nothing."

It is a question which every member of the church should put to his conscience, whether we, as a church, are doing our duty in sending educated men to teach the gospel to the heathen, and then so poorly to sustain them as to render it necessary for them to stand at the wash tub. This is no degradation to them, but it is to the church who allows its missionaries, whether foreign or domestic, to be reduced to such straits. This is not that justice and equality which Christ has enjoined; equality, not as to income, but as to adequate support, which it is the obvious duty of the church to provide for all those whom she sends to preach the gospel, in her stead, to the people.

The following resolutions were adopted at the suggestion of

the committee to whom the Report of the Board of Foreign Missions had been referred, viz.:

"1. *Resolved*, That the report of the Board affords to the Assembly very great cause of gratitude and thankfulness to Almighty God, and they would take encouragement from the past to increased effort for the future.

"2. *Resolved*, That while the general prospects of the Board are thus encouraging, as manifested by their enlarged operations among the heathen, and the increased contributions of the churches at home; yet the Assembly learn with pain that so many of our churches are doing nothing for this great cause; and they would most affectionately exhort the ministers of all our churches to urge upon their people their high privileges as well as imperative obligation to contribute of their substance to the furtherance of this noble work.

"3. *Resolved*, That in the deaths of two highly esteemed members of the Board, of two beloved missionaries while in the active field, the Assembly would see the hand of a wise and sovereign God; and they would learn from these providences to fill up the present day with usefulness, for the time is short.

"4. *Resolved*, While the Assembly rejoices to believe that the Board is highly efficient in the discharge of the duties committed to it, yet they would recognize the inefficiency of all human power to carry on this work, and they would call upon the whole church to be earnestly engaged in prayer to God for his blessing upon this great work.

"5. *Resolved*, That the Assembly would repeat the exhortations given in past years to the churches on the subject of the Monthly Concerts, reminding them of their duty to attend upon this meeting, and of the necessity of connecting with it a collection for the purpose of sending the gospel to the perishing heathen.

"6. *Resolved*, That the report be approved, and referred to the Executive Committee for publication."

### *Board of Domestic Missions.*

Dr. Spring, chairman of the committee to whom the report of this Board was referred, submitted the following minute, viz:

"1. That the report be adopted and published under the di-

rection of the Board, and that an abstract of it be inserted in the Appendix to the Minutes of the Assembly.

"2. *Resolved*, That it be earnestly recommended to the churches to make an annual collection for the object, and that the Synods and Presbyteries adopt such measures as in their judgment may best promote the designs of the Board.

"3. *Resolved*, That it be earnestly recommended to the churches to give their aid in the work of church extension, and that annual collections be made for this fund, distinct from that of Domestic Missions. This new feature in the plan of Domestic Missions proves the wisdom with which it has been conducted, and its great success strongly commends itself to the confidence of the Assembly.

"4. *Resolved*, That in the judgment of this Assembly the religious instruction of the coloured population in the Southern States calls for increasing attention and more vigorous effort.

"5. *Resolved*, That in their instructions to their missionaries the Board be directed to pay a due regard to Presbyterian rights, and that in the quarterly reports of their missions, no greater burthen be laid upon them than is necessary to keep the Board informed of the fidelity with which they fill their appointments.

"6. *Resolved*. That while the Assembly regret that a cause so rich in results already secured, and so full of promise, has failed to secure that universal patronage which it deserves, they express their devout gratitude to God that it is so obviously on the advance. It is but ten years since the seed was but "an handful of corn on the top of the mountains." We have realized the promise: "He that goeth forth weeping, bearing goodly seed, shall doubtless come again with rejoicing, bringing his sheaves with him." The resources and the success of the Board have increased more than two-fold within that period. Grateful praise and earnest prayer are due to the Lord of the harvest.

"7. *Resolved*, That the Assembly cannot refrain from saying, in their judgment, there is no department of their benevolent operations that has stronger claims upon the affections, prayers and energy of their fellow Christians and fellow countrymen, than the work of Domestic Missions. The magnitude of the work itself—the growing population of our country, from foreign,



as well as other sources—the fact that this vast field is submitted exclusively to the cultivation of American churches, together with the consideration that the American Church occupies so wide a place in the opening purposes of heavenly mercy to our world, call loudly upon the churches to consider their weighty responsibility in this matter, and to prosecute with augmented vigour, the great enterprise of supplying this land with the pure gospel.

“In concluding their report the committee have only to remind the Assembly that in accordance with a rule already adopted, it is incumbent on them to make such arrangements as shall, by the Divine favour, secure a discourse before the next General Assembly, on the subject of Domestic Missions.”

The only point which excited debate was that included in the fifth resolution. Some members seemed to think that there was something derogatory to the standing of a minister, and something inconsistent with his responsibility to his presbytery, in his being commissioned as a missionary by the Board and required to report to them. The general sentiment however seemed to be that there was no inconsistency between a minister's relation to the Board as a missionary and his relation to his presbytery as a presbyter. The two relations are distinct and compatible. All our foreign missionaries report to the committee in New York, and yet are as ministers responsible to their presbyteries. It was thought there was nothing derogatory in this, any more than there is in the military officer reporting to the war-department. The resolution as reported was adopted.

Towards the close of the sessions of the Assembly Dr. McGill introduced the following preamble and resolutions:

“WHEREAS a vast accession of territory to these United States and a rapid increase of population throughout the whole extent of our land, and the great multiplication of feeble churches that must arise if we are faithful at all to the claims of our country and our church, demand with unparalleled urgency, immediate, expansive, and strenuous exertions on the part of our Board of Missions: And whereas neither the present excellent and faithful Secretary who has conducted this great interest with signal ability and indefatigable toil, nor any other single individual is able to meet this overwhelming responsibility; and whereas it is highly important that the utmost unity, simplicity,

and economy should be studied in the prosecution of such a work, Therefore,

*“Resolved,* That the Board of Missions be required to appoint a co-ordinate Secretary as soon as they can obtain a suitable person for that office.

*“Resolved,* That the committee located at Louisville, with similar powers to that at Philadelphia, be dissolved, and that a general agent act in the field to that committee, intrusted now under the immediate direction of the Executive committee of Philadelphia.”

Dr. McDowell, Secretary of the Board, being called upon for an expression of his views on these points, declared himself in favour of the appointment of an additional Secretary, but opposed to the dissolution of the Louisville committee. In this view of the matter the Assembly concurred; the former of the above resolutions was adopted, the latter rejected.

#### *Education Board.*

The report of this Board, (which embraced a view of the operations of the church in relation to the whole department of education,) in the absence of the Secretary on account of severe illness, was read by Dr. Phillips. We regret that we have no abstract of this important document at hand. It contained abundant evidence of the efficiency and laborious devotedness of the agents and Secretary of the Board. Indeed when it is remembered that in addition to the superintendence of all those operations which have the support of candidates for the ministry for their object, the whole department of parochial schools, academies and colleges, so far as they are assisted by the church, is thrown upon the officers of this Board, and that in addition to all this the Secretary has the editorship of Presbyterian Treasury, a work in itself sufficient for one man, there is reason to apprehend that the health of those concerned will sink under such burdens. It is surely a mistaken policy and a short-sighted economy to break down the servants of the church, by overburdening them. We say this, not because we think the church indisposed to grant adequate assistance, but because the officers of our Boards are, in many cases, too backward in asking it.

Dr. Phillips offered the following minute which was adopted :

"The Committee to whom was referred the Annual Report of the Board of Education, recommend that it be approved, published under the direction of the Board, and commended to the careful perusal of all the churches; and they recommend the adoption of the following resolutions, viz:

"1. WHEREAS, It is the prerogative of God to call men to the work of the ministry, and to bestow upon them the essential qualifications for the offices; and whereas there is a pressing demand for an increased number of pious and educated ministers; Therefore, *Resolved*, That it is the duty and privilege of the Church to obey this command.

"2. Inasmuch as God works by means, and ordinarily blesses the faithful exertions of his people to secure a competent ministry; and whereas there are to be found young men of piety and talents, to whom he has given hearts to devote themselves to his service in the ministry, but who have not the pecuniary means necessary to defray the expenses of their education; Therefore, *Resolved*, That it is the duty of the Church, whose work they are willing to perform, to search them out, and provide funds for their education, and as far as they can do it, instrumentally to aid them in entering the ministry.

"3. *Resolved*, That it be earnestly recommended to our Presbyteries to exercise great care in receiving candidates for the ministry, and a constant supervision over them during the preparatory course of their education.

"4. The Assembly would again recommend to ministers and elders the establishment of primary schools, academies, and colleges, in which our youth may receive Christian and religious education.

"5. To enable the Board to prosecute their important work, and to follow up the successes which God has given them in it, the assembly would, and hereby do most earnestly request all their churches to contribute annually to their funds."

#### *Board of Publication.*

The report of this Board was read by the Secretary, the Rev. Mr. Leyburn. The principal facts which it contained may be found in the following abstract.

"The Board of Publication, during the year ending March

31st, 1849, have issued 261,750 copies of books and tracts. In this number are included 25,000 copies of seventeen new works, and 14,000 copies of thirty-three new tracts. The remainder is made up of re-issues of works before on the catalogue.

"Very considerable changes and improvements are making in getting up the books and tracts. The binding has been somewhat varied to suit the prevailing tastes; more attention is now paid to illustrating, especially children's books; and a considerable reduction has been made in the prices of most of the works. The Board are taking advantage of their increasing experience, and endeavouring in every practicable mode to render their publications attractive and available to all. Increasing attention has been paid to books for children; but great difficulty has been found in obtaining such works as would interest this class, without entering the regions of fiction to an extent from which the Board feel themselves conscientiously debarred. Much more would nevertheless have been accomplished during the year in this, as well as other departments of their operations, but for the fire, which having destroyed forty-five entire works, required that the labour of several months should be directed to replacing them.

"The wisdom and propriety of an organization such as this, is made more apparent every year. Previous to its origin, a Presbyterian library could not be obtained in the land. Regular book publishers were unwilling to undertake books of this description, and actually declined applications made to them for this end. The Board entered a new and untried sphere. It was afraid to risk a failure in what seemed so good an undertaking; and the result has been eminently successful. The amount of sound doctrinal and practical instruction which has already been conveyed throughout our whole Zion, is of itself far more than enough to compensate for the labour, time, and money which have been expended.

"The Board have entered fully on the colportage system, as the only means of effectually circulating their publications to the widest extent. If annual collections are afforded them by the Churches, they are ready to employ colporteurs, and furnish them with books and tracts, for sale and gratuitous distribution, wherever such labours are demanded. The efforts to secure funds for rebuilding have materially interfered with the incipi-



ent arrangements for colporteur enterprise. Nevertheless, something has been done. About forty colporteurs, including students, have been employed. They have laboured in the States of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Tennessee, Georgia, North Carolina, and Rhode Island; and the Synods of Virginia and Pittsburgh, and several Presbyteries are carrying on the work for themselves. Most of the colporteurs of the Board, however, have been too short a time in the field for the results of their labours to appear in this report; but they will be of the most cheering character.

"Frequent and earnest applications, and such as ought not to be refused, are made to the Board for donations in aid of needy ministers, feeble churches, and Sabbath schools, especially from the newer portions of the country, and these are increasing as the Church and country expand, and these publications become better known. And yet, how can the Board to any extent respond to them, unless furnished with annual contributions from the churches? Thousands of dollars are annually given by our people for the support of colporteurs and the circulation of books and tracts, to institutions with which we have no ecclesiastical connexion; why should not at least equal liberality be shown to our own Board. Are not our publications equally valuable? Do they not occupy the same general evangelical ground, but also offer such instructions for our own people as in the nature of things can be furnished from no other source? It is earnestly hoped that the churches will not withhold from the Board that aid which is so indispensable to its efficiency. The total amount received during the year is \$67,315.08, including \$10,528.49 paid on subscriptions for rebuilding, and \$17,138.26 received from the insurance companies principally for damages on stock."

Dr. L. W. Green, from the committee to whom this report was referred, offered the following resolutions, which were adopted.

"1. *Resolved*, That the General Assembly reiterate the expression of our entire confidence in the Board, our deep conviction of its importance to the vital interests of the church, and our extreme gratification at the increasing energy and widening influence of its operations.

"2. *Resolved*, That, next to the pulpit, the press is the great

instrumentality placed in our hands for moulding the opinions and deciding the destiny of the present and future generations; and in view of the condition of our country, and all the aspects of the age in which we live, the Presbyterian church, as a branch of the church universal upon earth, is solemnly called by her allegiance to her Head, to employ with far greater energy and combined co-operation than heretofore, this potent instrumentality for the diffusion of those precious truths, so ably embodied in the standards of our church.

*"3. Resolved,* Therefore, that we solemnly express our fixed conviction that the Board of Publication ought to be viewed by all our people as one of the great schemes of the church, for the illumination and salvation of the world, co-ordinate with the Boards of Education, and of Domestic and Foreign Missions capable of being elevated by the wise liberality of the church, to the same commanding position and extensive influence, and as such we earnestly recommend it to the cordial and systematic support of all our congregations.

*"4. Resolved,* That the system of colportage adopted by the Board is not only a valuable auxiliary, but, in the present condition of our country, with its advancing population, sweeping rapidly beyond the reach of a settled ministry and all the means of grace, must be considered a necessary means of the widest diffusion and most effective influence of our publications, and the General Assembly have heard, with peculiar pleasure, that many of our candidates for the ministry are engaged during the interval of study in the prosecution of this important work, so full of benefit to others, and still more of valuable instruction to themselves; we would, therefore, urge the Board to pursue, with redoubled activity, this department of their labours, and throw themselves upon the liberality of the churches for any additional expense which may be necessarily incurred.

*"5. Resolved,* That the increasing demand for our publications, from Parochial and Sabbath Schools, and the deluge of fictitious narratives and sentimental religionism pouring in upon our children from every quarter, should direct the intense attention of the Board to the preparation of works adapted to the capacities and wants of youth, and fitted to aid and guide the teachers in the performance of their arduous and important duties.

"6. *Resolved*, That while we highly approve the principle of the Board to publish valuable works in a durable form and of the best materials, without regard to price, we would strongly express our deliberate conviction that cheaper editions might often accomplish a more valuable result, and obtain for our publications a wider circulation and more effective influence.

"7. *Resolved*, That it is earnestly recommended to all our congregations to take up regular collections annually, in behalf of the Board of Publication."

The resolutions were unanimously adopted.

### *Judicial Case, No. 1.*

Dr. Plumer, from the judicial committee, reported on the case of the appeal of W. H. Marquiss, against the Presbytery of Nashville, as follows:

"The Judicial Committee report that they have examined certain papers entitled an appeal and complaint of W. H. Marquiss against the Presbytery of Nashville, with other papers belonging thereto; and unanimously recommend the adoption of the following minute:

"1. That the Presbytery of Nashville having fully exonerated the appellant from all blame in the matters respecting which he was charged before the session of the church of Clarksville, his character is unimpeached, and that he is now, and has been ever since the action of Presbytery in his case, entitled to a dismissal from the church at Clarksville, whenever applied for, in order to connect himself with any church in the vicinity of his present residence, and that there is nothing in the action of Presbytery in relation to the charges preferred against him which furnishes grounds for appeal or complaint.

"2. In relation to the spirit and temper manifested in the progress of any trial, the judicatory alone before whom the matter regularly comes, is competent to form an opinion, and that the mere record of this opinion, even if erroneous, is not a ground of appeal or complaint.

"3. In relation to the publication of a pamphlet by Mr. Marquiss, pending the decision of his case, the Presbytery of Nashville did no more than repeat the judgment of the General Assembly, given more than once concerning such publications,

and as the Presbytery passed no sentence upon Mr. M. for this step, there is no ground of appeal or complaint.

"4. That the high character of the appellant, and all those to whom these papers relate, is a guaranty to the General Assembly that they will henceforth study things which make for peace, forbearing one another in love.

"5. That the papers be returned to the persons from whom they were received."

The second of the above resolutions elicited considerable debate, but was finally adopted. Notice of dissent or protest was given by several members, but at a subsequent meeting, the chairman of the judicial committee moved a reconsideration of that part of the report, which motion being carried, he moved that the second resolution be stricken out, which was agreed to. The objection urged against the resolution was, that it asserted in too broad a form that no expression of opinion by a judicatory of the temper and spirit of a person on trial could be a ground of complaint or appeal. It might be admitted that in the case under consideration, the expression of its disapprobation, recorded by the Presbytery of Nashville, was perfectly proper, but it was urged that cases might be supposed in which great injustice might be done by such records.

### *Second Judicial Case.*

This case was an appeal by Rev. J. Leroy Davies, from a decision of the Synod of North Carolina, affirming a decision of the Presbytery of Concord, suspending him from the gospel ministry, on the following charges and specifications, viz.:

"Common fame charges the Rev. J. Leroy Davies with conduct not only unbecoming in a Christian, but highly derogatory to the character of a Christian minister, and seriously reproachful to religion, in the following particulars, viz:

"*Specification 1st.*—Insubordination to the Presbytery, in his continuing to preach; and encouraging the building up of a branch of Prospect church, within the reputed bounds of Centre, without the consent either of the Presbytery, or of the Session of Centre, almost immediately after the dissolution of the pastoral relation by the Presbytery, and very shortly after his confessions of sin, professions of penitence, and promises of



subordination and circumspect deportment made to the Presbytery, at the close of his recent trial.

*"Specification 2d.*—False representations and fraudulent measures in his procuring the transfer of members from Centre to Prospect church; in his reporting to the Presbytery at Marion some sixty-one members, as received into Prospect on certificate, some of whom had neither applied for a dismission, nor authorized such application; and in his reporting to the church of Prospect some sixty-one additions on certificates, the most, if not all, of whom were from the church of Centre, of whom he had not authority from the Session of Centre to grant more than two or three certificates of dismission."

The following was the sentence of the Presbytery in this case:

"That in view of all the facts and circumstances, in view of the testimony spread upon the minutes in the case, and in view of the clear connection of his conduct in this case with his previous trial and confessions, therefore—*Resolved*, That the Rev. J. Leroy Davies be, and he is hereby suspended from the office of the gospel ministry, until he give to this Presbytery satisfactory evidence of his penitency for the crimes of which he has now been convicted."

The Notice of Appeal, which had been placed before the Presbytery by the Rev. J. Leroy Davies, was then read, as follows:

"I hereby give written notice to the Presbytery of Concord, that I intend to appeal, and I do hereby appeal, from the judgment this day rendered, to the Synod of North Carolina, which appeal and reasons thereof I intend to lodge with the proper officer, within the time specified by the Constitution.

"June 8, 1848.

J. LEROY DAVIES."

An extract from the minutes of the Synod of North Carolina was then read.

The Rev. Dr. Plumer acted as counsel for Mr. Davies, and Messrs. Rockwell and Wilson for the Synod and Presbytery, After the parties had been fully heard the roll was called for the judgment of every member, and the vote was taken on the question, "Shall the appeal be sustained in whole or in part?" It appeared a majority of the house voted to sustain in part. A committee was then appointed to bring in a

minute expressive of the judgment of the Assembly in the case; which minute, as finally adopted, is as follows:

"1. Resolved, That in regard to the first allegation against Mr. Davies, viz: of insubordination and schismatical conduct, the decision of the Synod in his case be confirmed.

"2. Resolved, That while the Assembly do not approve the conduct of Mr. Davies, in relation to the transfer of members from the church of Centre to the church of Prospect, in their judgment, the charge of misrepresentation and falsehood is not sustained, and in this particular they sustain the appeal of Mr. Davies.

"3. Resolved, That while Assembly adopt the preceding resolutions, in their judgment, there was error in the Synod of North Carolina in expressing a judicial opinion in relation to charges against Mr. Davies which did not come before them.

"4. Resolved, That in view of all the circumstances of the case, the decision of the inferior judicatory be reversed; and that Mr. Davies be, and he hereby is restored to the functions of the sacred office, and that he be solemnly enjoined hereafter more scrupulously to consult the peace and unity of the church."

#### *Western Theological Seminary.*

Rev. Thomas L. Janeway presented the following report in relation to this institution, which was adopted.

"The Committee to whom was referred the 22d Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the Western Theological Seminary, present the following resolutions, viz:

"1. That the said Report be approved, and printed in the appendix to the minutes of the General Assembly.

"2. That the Assembly learn with pleasure that the same excellent and worthy Professors are continued, in the good providence of God, to labour in this important institution, and that their efforts in training candidates for the work of the ministry are still blessed, and that a respectable body of students have been gathered into the Seminary, whose proficiency in learning and piety is matter of devout praise to God.

"3. That the Assembly are happy to learn that the endowing of the two Professorships is likely to be realized, and the great embarrassments through which the Seminary has waded have ceased, and that by leases of property, unemployed for the pur-

poses of the institution, hope to command yet greater means for the advancement of Christ's kingdom, in the assistance afforded to pious men in preparation for their great work.

"4. The Assembly have heard with regret the afflictive visitation of God, which scattered the students for a period, and laid two of them low in death, and we receive it as an admonition to work while the day lasts, and God permits us to engage in his holy and blessed service.

"5. That as the institution has been located and continued by successive Assemblies in Allegheny, it is just that not only the Synods which have, for more than twenty years of unrelieved toil, borne the burthen of its support, but other portions of our church may be expected to aid in completing the endowment of an institution from which so many ministers have gone forth to labour in the West, and in which some of the earliest and best beloved of the missionaries of our Board have been trained. And as the prospects of the whole church are identified with its interests equally with other seminaries, *this* may properly expect the sympathy and receive the benefactions of our people."

### *Princeton Theological Seminary.*

The Rev. T. L. Janeway presented the annual report of the Directors of the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N. J.; also several letters from the Rev. Samuel Miller, D. D., tendering his resignation of his office as Professor in that Institution, and the Report of the Directors, stating their action in regard to Dr. Miller's resignation. These papers were referred to the following committee: Messrs. Plumer, V. D. Reed, Janeway, Williamson, Wallace, S. Steele, Gilchrist, Smock, *ministers*; and W. Lowrie, J. H. Brown, and Henderson, *elders*.

This committee made the following report:

"I. In relation to the general report of the Directors, the committee recommend the adoption of the following resolutions:

"1. Resolved, That the thanks of the whole church are due to the Lord of the harvest, in raising up and inclining to the ministry, the number of one hundred and fifty young men, who have been connected with the Seminary during the past year, and that their examinations have been so thorough and satisfactory.

"2. Resolved, That the Assembly has heard with pleasure of the prevalence to a cheering extent of the missionary spirit in the institution, and earnestly hope that all having control of the students will continue to cherish in them the most enlarged views of the work of the ministry.

"3. Resolved, That the nominations for Directors to fill the places of Drs. Spring, W. A. McDowell, William Neil, W. D. Snodgrass, Joseph McElroy, G. W. Musgrave, and Rev. S. Beach Jones, together with John T. Woodhull, M. D., A. W. Mitchell, M. D., and Hugh Auchincloss, Esq., for three years, and for the unexpired term of Mr. James Donaldson, which is one year, be now received, and a time fixed for the election.

"4. Resolved, That the Report of the Directors be printed in the appendix to the minutes of the General Assembly.

"II. In relation to the tender of resignation of his Professorship by the Rev. Dr. Miller, they recommend the adoption of the following resolutions by the Assembly, viz.:

"1. Resolved, That the Assembly unites with the Board of Directors in expressions of thankfulness to God, that he has spared the life and health of the venerable Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Church Government for so many years, and that our beloved church has enjoyed the benefit of his valued instructions and labours from the infancy of this Seminary to this time.

"2. Resolved, That the Assembly unites with the Board in recording their grateful sense of the manifold faithful and most important services which the venerable Professor has rendered to our church, and to the cause of truth and righteousness, and they beg to assure him of their cordial sympathy in the bodily infirmities which have led him to seek a release from the duties of this office.

"3. Resolved, That the Rev. Samuel Miller, D. D., be, and hereby is entirely released from all obligation to give instruction in each and all of the departments of his Professorship.

"4. Resolved, That Dr. Miller be requested to give such instruction, and perform such services, as, on consultation with his fellow Professors, may be convenient and agreeable to himself.

"5. Resolved, That the Rev. Samuel Miller, D. D., shall continue to enjoy intact the salary and all the other rights of his



Professorship during his natural life, under the title of Emeritus Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Church Government.

"6. Resolved, That this Assembly, upon the adoption of this report, will receive nominations, and fix a time for the election of a Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Church Government.

"7. Resolved, That the Board of Directors of the Seminary be authorized to send an agent or agents to any and every part of this church where they think proper, for the purpose of receiving a sum to pay the salary of the Rev. Professor, which is fixed at \$2,000."

This report was adopted unanimously. Nominations were then made for the professorship of Ecclesiastical History and Church Government. The Rev. James W. Alexander, D. D., of New York; the Rev. Dr. Plumer, of Baltimore; the Rev. Dr. Spring, of New York; the Rev. Thomas Smythe, D. D., of Charleston, S. C.; the Rev. Nathan L. Rice, D. D., of Cincinnati, Ohio; the Rev. Nicholas Murray, D. D., of Elizabethtown, N. J., were nominated. Drs. Plumer, Spring and Murray all declined to be considered candidates. The Assembly then united in prayer for the guidance of the Head of the Church. After this it was resolved that a majority of all the votes cast should be necessary to the choice of professor. The election was made the first order of the day for Saturday morning, allowing, agreeably to rule, two days to intervene between the nomination and election.

On Saturday morning the ballots were collected and counted, when it appeared that the

Rev. J. W. Alexander, D. D., had received 110 votes.

Dr. N. L. Rice, . . . . . 34 "

Dr. Thomas Smythe, . . . . . 16 "

Dr. N. Murray, . . . . . 4 "

Dr. G. Spring, . . . . . 1 "

On motion, it was resolved, that the Moderator and Dr. Phillips be a committee to inform Dr. Alexander of his election, and to prosecute this call before the Presbytery of New York.

*Posture in Public Prayer.*

The Presbytery of Philadelphia presented an overture asking the Assembly to adopt measures for arresting or abating

the growing evil of sitting during public prayer. The committee of bills and overtures presented on this subject the following report, which was adopted, viz :

"While the posture of standing in public prayer, and that of kneeling in private prayer, are indicated by example in the scripture, and the general practice of the ancient Christian church, the position of sitting in public prayer is nowhere mentioned, and by no usage allowed, but, on the contrary, was universally regarded by the early church as heathenish and irreverent, and is still even among the modern and western nations, an attitude obviously wanting in the due expression of reverence—therefore this Assembly

*"Resolve,* That the practice in question be considered grievously improper, wherever the infirmities of the worshippers do not render it necessary; and that ministers be required to reprove it with earnest and persevering admonition."

We hope this subject will receive from the churches the attention it deserves. Whatever concerns the proprieties of public worship, concerns the interests of religion and the glory of God. It cannot be denied that the feeling of reverence will express itself by appropriate outward signs, and therefore the absence or neglect of those outward expressions is evidence of the absence of the inward feeling. It is no less true, that as the feeling produces the outward expression, so the latter tends to cherish the former. There is, therefore, in the very constitution of our nature a reason why that posture should be assumed in prayer which is expressive of devotion. In all ages and countries standing, kneeling, and prostration or bowing down, have been recognised as the proper expressions of reverence. These, therefore, are the only suitable postures for prayer. Accordingly we find in scriptures all these recognised and sanctioned. Sitting is irreverent, unnatural, unscriptural, and therefore offensive and injurious. There may be room for debate which of the three postures above mentioned, is most suitable for public worship—but there can be none whatever as between either of them and sitting. In favour of standing we have the clear authority of scripture, the example of the early church, and the distinctive usage of our own denomination. It should therefore be enjoined and urged with all due authority by those who have the oversight of the churches.

*Slavery.*

Several memorials on this subject were placed in the hands of the committee of Bills and Overtures, which report the following resolutions on the subject, which were adopted almost unanimously.

"1. *Resolved*, That the principles of the Presbyterian Church on the subject of slavery, are already set forth in repeated declarations, so full and explicit as to require no further exposition.

"2. *Resolved*, That in view of the civil and domestic nature of this institution, the competency of secular legislatures alone to remove it, and in view of the earnest inquiry and deep agitation on this subject, which we observe in one or more commonwealths of our country, where slavery exists, it be considered peculiarly improper or inexpedient for this General Assembly to attempt to propose any measures in the work of emancipation.

"3. *Resolved*, That all necessary and proper provision is already made for the just exercise of discipline upon those who violate the mutual duties of master and servant, and the General Assembly is always ready to enforce these provisions, when the unfaithfulness of any inferior court is made manifest by record, or appeal, or complaint.

"4. *Resolved*, That we rejoice to believe that the action of former Assemblies, so far from aiding or allowing the iniquitous oppression of man by his fellow man, has been steadily promoting amelioration in the condition of slaves, by winning the confidence of masters, in our freedom from fanaticism, and by stimulating the slaveholder and his pastor alike to labour in the religious instruction of the blacks.

"5. *Resolved*, That it be enjoined on Presbyteries situated in slaveholding States, to continue and increase their exertions for the instruction of slaves, and to report distinctly in their annual narratives to the General Assembly, the state of religion among the coloured population."

The Rev. H. Nevin presented a protest against these resolutions, which was admitted to record without answer.

*Support of Aged Ministers.*

This subject was brought before the Assembly by an overture from the Presbytery of Elizabethtown and was warmly

urged especially by several of the elders on the floor of the house, especially Mr. Barnet, of Dayton, Ohio, and Mr. Inglis, of Georgia.

The following preamble and resolutions were finally adopted on this subject.

"WHEREAS, There are many disabled and superannuated ministers in connexion with the Presbyterian Church, and the widows and families of Presbyterian ministers who are in indigent circumstances; and as the church increases, their number is likely to increase; and whereas it is the duty of the church to provide for those who have devoted their time and spent their energies in her service, and also for their families; and whereas no local provision can effectually meet this object, and no efficient general provision has ever yet been made, Therefore,

"1. *Resolved*, That in order to constitute a fund for the support of the widows and families of deceased ministers, and for the relief of superannuated and disabled living ministers, it is hereby enjoined on all our Synods and Presbyteries to take such action as may secure a contribution annually.

"2. *Resolved*, That a column be added to the table of statistical reports for these contributions.

"3. *Resolved*, That the funds thus contributed be placed in the hands of the Board of Trustees of the General Assembly, to be distributed by the Board of Publication, upon the recommendation of Presbyteries, as the funds for Domestic Missions, Education, and Church Extension are now appropriated.

"4. *Resolved*, That in order to the founding of a permanent fund for this same object, special contributions and legacies be invited from all parts of the church, the principal of which shall be safely invested by the Board of Trustees of the General Assembly, and the interest be added to the General fund, provided for in the foregoing resolution."

#### *Examination of Ministers.*

"An overture from various ministers and elders, objecting to a resolution of the General Assembly in 1837, making it imperative on Presbyteries to examine all ministers who make application for admission into their bodies, and praying this Assembly to repeal that resolution, or change it from its imperative



form to one of recommendation; or send it down to the Presbyteries by overture, to have it added as another section to the tenth chapter of our Form of Government.

"The committee recommend that, inasmuch as the General Assembly must have power to enjoin upon Presbyteries the performance of any duty which they are confessedly competent to do by the provisions of the Constitution, and in requiring which, no right is violated, and nothing constrained, but the discretion they had in ordinary circumstances; and inasmuch as the general utility of that resolution is not yet called in question, even by the respected memorialists themselves, therefore the Assembly decline acceding to this request for the present.

"This report was adopted."

### *Weekly Paper.*

The Presbytery of Huntingdon sent up an overture on the subject of a cheap weekly paper, and the Rev. Mr. Sickles introduced a resolution instructing the Board of Publication to publish a specimen number of such paper, and to continue the publication as soon as a sufficient number of subscribers should be obtained. The whole subject was finally referred to Rev. Mr. Nourse, Rev. Dr. W. Lord, Dr. Van Rensselaer, Dr. McKinney, and Messrs. W. Lowrie, and J. H. Brown, to report to the next Assembly.

This subject excited a good deal of interest and is doubtless one of great importance. It may be viewed in different aspects. It may be considered financially, as a mere matter of business. Can a good paper be sustained and afforded at a dollar a year? This is a question which different business men would answer in different ways. When the expense of paper, of composition, of editors, and contributors, and the loss from wear and tear and bad debts, are taken in view, it would seem to be impossible that one dollar would afford adequate remuneration for such a work. Then again, those papers which charge \$3 00 or \$2 50, in many cases, barely sustain themselves. The fact that \$2 50 has been fixed upon in all parts of the country as the average price of a weekly religious paper, is a strong indication that such is a fair price, and that the desire to obtain the profit and pleasure of such a publication at a less price is unreasonable. It is a desire to enjoy the labour of others without

paying for it. But on the other hand, the expense of publication decreases very rapidly when the number of copies is increased. There is reason to hope that such a number of subscribers for a dollar paper might be obtained, and such terms of payment insisted upon, as to make the experiment in a financial point of view successful. Besides, there are dollar newspapers, (unconnected with daily papers) which are sustained. The financial question therefore is open to debate. This is a field in which a man of wise enterprise might perhaps succeed.

A second and more serious aspect of this question relates to the publication or editing of such a paper. The objections to placing it in the hands of the Board of Publication are such as these: The publication of a weekly paper, of large circulation, is an immense concern, involving great labour and attention. This is too great a burden, it may be said, to impose on that Board which already has its hands full. All such enterprises succeed better in private hands than in the hands of corporations or boards. There is a great deal of risk and many tentative efforts to be made, which a man is willing to make in his own business, which a corporation would be slow to undertake. There is and must also be the lack of that impulse of self-interest for which alas! zeal for the church is seldom an adequate compensation. Then again, who is to be the editor? When a newspaper is to be the mouth-piece of an individual, its authority and influence are great. What will it be when it is the mouth-piece of the church! Who is the man whom you mean to invest with the power to express the mind of the church on all questions once a week to 50,000 or 100,000 readers? Men talk of the undue power of our Boards and Seminaries, what would the power of all the Boards and all the Seminaries in the land be, compared to the influence of such an organ? The London Times is spoken of as a fourth estate in the British empire. If we had an official paper, with such a circulation as is anticipated its conductors would be invested with an influence, for good or evil, which would make them a substantive estate in the church. The power of the press while free, dispersed, and open to competition, is legitimate and healthful; but when concentrated and exalted above competition, it becomes a very different affair. This suggests what perhaps is the gravest ob-

jection to this plan, and that is, that it would destroy all competition. A dollar paper edited by a Board, at the centre of information, sustained by official influence and patronage, would supersede all the local papers of the land. A very large circulation, it is admitted, must be secured to admit of such a paper being sold at one dollar per annum. No paper confined to one district of the church can command such a circulation, and therefore no such paper could be afforded at such a price. All publications of the kind restricted in their circulation, must disappear before the great central organ. The question then is, whether it is better to have one paper or many? Whether all the good done by these numerous publications, each adapted to its peculiar district, can be accomplished, or adequately compensated, by one paper conveying one view of all matters to every part of the church? We doubt this very much.

This whole question, however, is in a great measure new to the church. It ought to be fully discussed. We have expressed the views of the subject which suggest themselves at the moment to us. We have no prejudices, and no fixed judgment on the matter, and are open to conviction. As far, however, as we can see at present, we think it would be better to leave the subject to private enterprise. It is not properly a church business.

### *Preaching without Notes.*

Mr. E. T. Baird presented the following resolution:

"WHEREAS, This General Assembly has reason to believe that the practice of reading sermons in the pulpit is on the increase among our ministers; and being decidedly of opinion that it is not the most effective and acceptable method of preaching the Gospel. Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we do earnestly repeat the recommendation of the Assembly of 1841, that this practice be discontinued as far as practicable, and affectionately exhort our younger ministers, and candidates for the ministry, to adopt a different method, as more scriptural and effective, and more generally acceptable to God's people.

"Dr. Plumer moved to lay the resolution on the table

"Division was called for, and 56 voted to lay on the table and 76 against it.

"Dr. Plumer: When such a subject as this is taken up by an Assembly, it is absurd to expect to do any thing for the edification of the church of God, by means of a mere resolution: and if this resolution is adopted, does not the Assembly thereby express by their vote that Samuel Davies was not a pattern of preaching—that he who never, on any solemn occasion, entered the pulpit without having every word written, with a determination not to depart from his manuscript, who was the best preacher of his day—the man who has left behind him the best gospel sermons which were ever printed, that he to whom the king of Great Britain listened with awe—that this servant of God knew not how to preach to edification; and that Dr. Chalmers did not do right who always laid his manuscript before him. The best sermon I ever heard from Dr. Archibald Alexander, of Princeton, were from his manuscripts. What do you do by this vote? Do you change the practice of the church? Do you effect any thing but to put an instrument in the hands of certain self-conceited members of the church, to find fault with their minister. Whenever I preach on the 'Trinity, or any abstruse doctrine of the gospel, when I want to weigh every word, and give sound doctrine to my people, I will use a manuscript. I will do it when I please. I never will consent to take instructions from such a quarter. I'll carry my manuscripts where I please, and use them when I please. I am not responsible for this to the Assembly, or to any man, or body of men. The only effect of legislation on this matter will be vexation."

After considerable discussion the resolution was adopted. We are of the number of those who think all such legislation unwise and derogatory to the character of the Assembly. Such matters lie beyond the legitimate sphere of their action. Their votes on such subjects can change no man's practice, and therefore only serve to lessen the dignity of the body that passes them. In some parts of the church one method of preaching is preferred, and in others a different. Such preferences cannot be altered by the resolutions of any ecclesiastical body. Besides this, the sentiment expressed is one sided. No one mode of preaching is best for all men, or for all circumstances. Men must be left free to follow their own tastes or talents, and to adapt themselves to the circumstances in which they are placed. To



force the same method on all, would be like making all wear clothes of the same size and pattern.

There are three different modes of preaching which have their peculiar advantages and disadvantages. The first is that of mental composition, when not merely the heads or outline of the discourse, but the whole sermon is fully elaborated and impressed on the mind before going into the pulpit. This is the method in which the great speeches of such men as Webster and Calhoun, Lord Brougham and Sir Robert Peel are prepared. And in this way some of the first preachers of our own and of other churches are accustomed to indite their discourses. This is perhaps of all methods the best. It is however laborious. It requires great mental discipline, and great self-denial to carry out this method. It is also expensive. Discourses thus prepared perish usually with the delivery. We have heard it said by some who adopt this method, that it is as difficult for them to preach an old sermon as to make a new one. This is a great disadvantage. For so much depends on the bodily and mental state of the man when called upon to prepare a discourse, that if he must always depend on his present state, and have no provision laid up from whence to draw, he must often labour to great disadvantage.

The second method is to write out the discourse, and then commit it, or familiarize the mind with it so as to read it more or less freely. There are indefinite degrees of confinement to notes in the delivery of a written sermon. This has been the plan adopted by many of the greatest preachers the world ever knew. This was the method of Bossuet, Massillon, Bourdaloue, Saurin, of Edwards, Davies, Tennent, Chalmers. Even Whitefield and Wesley often adopted this method. This plan is laborious. There is indeed such a thing as extempore writing, as well as extempore speaking. But most men when they write, must think. The very process of putting their thoughts on paper gives them a definite form. Writing is the very best method of mental discipline. And the exceptions are so few to the remark, that no man understands a subject on which he has not written, as not to need being taken into account. Writing sermons and using notes more or less in their delivery, we therefore believe to be one of the very best means of securing not merely instructive and effective sermons, but a studious and

progressive ministry. We hail the increase of this method as proof of the intellectual progress of our church, and as one of the best omens of its true prosperity. We heard one of the most popular preachers of Alabama, if not the most popular in that or any of the southern states, say, that he always wrote his discourses, and that all the most promising ministers of his part of the country were in the same habit. While this method secures studious habits, intellectual progress, and instructive preaching, it has the further advantage of associating itself naturally with the other methods. It is impossible that a minister should write all the sermons he is called upon to deliver. Those most addicted to writing, probably deliver two discourses without notes to one with. Their weekly lectures, funeral and occasional sermons, are seldom or never written. It is said a young man asked the late Dr. Richards how many sermons a man could write in a week. The Doctor replied, a first-rate man could write one, a common man two, and that he knew some men who could write a dozen. The danger is not that writing will become too common, but that speaking without writing, which every minister must do so frequently, will supersede the more laborious method of preparation.

The third method of preaching is what is properly called extempore. By this we mean the plan of depending on the moment not merely for the language, but for the thoughts. This, of course, admits of degrees. The common method of extempore preachers is to think over a subject, and frame a general outline of the discourse in their minds, and leave the filling up to be suggested at the time of delivery. This previous preparation may be carried so far as to merge this plan into the first above mentioned; or it may amount to nothing more than may be done in a few minutes.

This is the easiest of all methods of preaching. There is not one man in a thousand who cannot attain the gift of extempore speaking. This is proved by the fact that all Methodist and Baptist ministers make the attainment. So do ninety-nine hundredths of all men who enter the ministry in other denominations. It is the lowest of all attainments, requiring nothing beyond composure, which, to some men, is natural, and by others is soon acquired. As it is the easiest, so it is the laziest of all methods. A man may teach, or farm, or engage all the week

in what business he pleases. He wants but a few minutes before service on Sabbath, to be prepared for an hour's flow of words. As it is the laziest, so it is the most unprofitable method both to speaker and hearer. Some men of natural eloquence will occasionally stir up the emotions of an audience and produce a powerful effect, but the general run of such preaching is vapid common-place. None but a man of rare abilities, of large and varied attainments, of mature and well digested knowledge, should venture to turn the spigot of his mind, and let the thoughts that first come run out for the nourishing of the people. If the sole object of preaching was excitement, there might be some reason in preferring a method whose only advantage is fervour. One of the speakers on the floor of the Assembly, asked how a lady would make out, who should undertake to scold from notes. The very illustration betrays the lowest possible conception of the office of a preacher. A preacher is no scolder, nor is he a mere exhorter, but a *διδάσκαλος*. Teaching is his peculiar official duty; and none but a very thoroughly informed, or an inordinately conceited man, would think of teaching any grave subject extempore—least of all, the awful mysteries of God. These remarks have reference of course to extempore preaching, properly so called; and not to mere preaching without notes, after due preparation. The main thing is preparation. And it is because writing, in the great majority of cases, is essential to the habit of proper preparation for the pulpit, we are so desirous it should not be neglected. All the tendencies are towards such neglect, and the authority of the Assembly, in our humble judgment, was far more needed in the other scale.

---

## QUARTERLY LIST OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

**The Earth and Man:** Lectures on Comparative Physical Geography, in its Relation to the History of Mankind. By Arnold Guyot, Professor of Physical Geography and History, at Neuchatel, Switzerland. Translated from the French, by

C. C. Felton, Professor in Harvard University. Boston:  
Gould, Kendall & Lincoln.

It is with no ordinary gratification, that we hail the appearance of these interesting lectures. We trust that they will be not a little instrumental in attracting attention to the important subject of which they treat; a subject far too little known, and still less appreciated.

When we state that Professor Guyot was the pupil and friend of Humboldt and Ritter, we have said enough to show that his opportunities for acquiring information upon the subject of which he treats, have been of no ordinary character. We do but re-echo opinions already extensively expressed, when we say, moreover, that to the knowledge thus acquired he has added the results of his own observations; and, having made the subject his own, has presented it in form at once attractive and instructive.

Professor Guyot has done more than this. Availing himself of abundant opportunities for so doing, he has thoroughly investigated the so called modern systems of Philosophy, and found their emptiness; and having arrived at the firm conviction, that the acknowledgment of the living God of the Bible, and the recognition of His Providence, are essential prerequisites to the prosecution of all true science, he has uniformly and uncompromisingly been guided by it and conformed to it, in all his course of instruction.

Most sincerely, then, should all who love true science and can appreciate results such as these, welcome to our shores this enlightened Christian philosopher. Unwittingly, but most efficiently, have they illustrated the cardinal truth in his teachings, who have presented him to us, by driving him from a country which was no longer tolerable; because freedom of thought and the free expression of thought were there no longer possible—though they “mean not so, neither in their hearts do they think so.”

The lectures, as the title indicates, were delivered in the French language, and have been translated by Professor Felton. Seldom, if ever, have we seen any thing so terse and beautiful, in its way, as the dedication of the book to the translator. It can scarcely fail at once to interest the reader in the work and its author, and excite the wish to know more of both.

One of the very best evidences of the just appreciation in which Professor Guyot's lectures have been held, is to be found in the fact that he is about to undertake a series of elementary works on Physical Geography, “in compliance with the earnest solicitations of many teachers and friends of education.”

Outlines of English Literature. By Thomas B. Shaw, B. A.,  
Professor of English Literature in the Imperial Lyceum of  
St. Petersburg. Philadelphia: Lea & Blanchard. 1849.

Those who have kept an eye to the issues of the press, have noticed with pleasure, a steady increase of works designed to popularise subjects formerly confined to the student or the scholar. The loftiest inductions of science, and the most recondite doctrines of art, are spread out before the



popular mind in forms adapted at once to stimulate and nourish their intellectual tastes. In this process, as might have been expected, literature, and at last English literature, has found a place. With the help of books, which are now accessible to every body, even common readers may be as familiar with the critical merits of all our standard authors, back to the very age of Chaucer, as formerly they were with the fairy tales of the nursery, the romances of De Foe, or the allegories of Bunyan. Among the recent popular works, historical and critical, on the noble literature of our tongue, we should give a very high place to this modest volume of Professor Shaw; chiefly because it is the only one which is strictly a readable book. Some of the others contain a much larger amount of matter, and more historical, biographical, and literary information; but for the philosophy of our literature, for racy and comprehensive criticism, and for a general and connected view of our literary history, and the causes, instruments and nature of the several "schools of writing," which have prevailed at different periods, we know of nothing, in equal compass, at all comparable to this interesting sketch.

We do not wish to be understood as concurring in all Professor Shaw's literary judgments, or expressing equal approbation of every feature of the book. Some of his criticisms we regard as out of all proportion to the comparative value of the authors; and from others we should strongly dissent, both on moral and literary grounds; while others still strike us as exaggerated and indiscriminate praise. But this is unavoidable in a work comprehending so wide a range,—reaching from Chaucer to Dickens,—and where the standard of judgment is so variable as the tastes of men. But with an occasional demurrer of this sort, we do not hesitate to say that, in our judgment, the execution of the work would be creditable to the pages of the great veteran in the critical world, the Edinburgh, even in the palmy days of Jeffrey.

**Principles of Zoölogy, touching the Structure, Development, Distribution, and Natural Arrangement of the Races of Animals, living and extinct; with numerous Illustrations. For the use of Schools and Colleges. Part 1. Comparative Physiology. By Louis Agassiz and Augustus A. Gould. Boston: Gould, Kendall & Lincoln, 59 Washington street. 1848. pp. 216, 12mo.**

It is a great mistake to suppose that good elementary works upon any branch of knowledge can be prepared by those who are themselves but superficially acquainted with that branch. No one who has not been compelled to use text books prepared by persons of this description, which unfortunately are very common in our country, can enter into the feelings of pleasure with which we have examined this admirable little volume. We were fully aware, as of course our readers are, of the pre-eminent qualifications of Professor Agassiz, who probably has no superior living, and very few equals, in the department of zoology; and we were not strangers

to the scientific labours and attainments of Dr. Gould, who is one of our most accomplished American naturalists. But the manufacture of text-books has become so much of a mercantile speculation among us, that we took up the book with no small apprehension that we might find it to be a hasty and careless production, for the benefit of the trade; and for which its authors felt little responsibility or anxiety, farther than to make it sell. In this we are most happy to find ourselves wholly mistaken. It is really a great book,—that is, it is such a book as none but a great naturalist could produce. There is not a paragraph that does not bear the signature of a master's hand. It contains not only a lucid and beautiful exposition of the general principles of the science, so far as it goes, but also physiological principles and details of exceeding interest, which we are confident cannot be found elsewhere in our language, except perhaps in detached articles in the scientific journals. And we must not forget to mention another admirable and crowning excellence of the work as a text-book;—namely, that it springs from, and is pervaded by an intelligent and true religious spirit; and applies itself with excellent effect, and with the authority of a master in science, to the cure of materialism on the one hand, and pantheism on the other; with one or other of which imposing religious errors, our aspiring youthful tyros in science, are so apt to become enamoured.

**Man Primeval; or, the Constitution and Primitive Condition of the Human Being. A Contribution to Theological Science.** By John Harris, D. D., President of Cheshunt College, author of "The Great Commission," "The Great Teacher," "The Pre-Adamite Earth," &c. Boston: Gould, Kendall & Lincoln, 59 Washington street. 1849.

"In the Preface to the 'Pre-Adamite Earth,'" says the author, "I stated that the principles or laws there adduced, and applied to the successive stages of the ancient earth, would be exhibited in their historical development, in a short series of treatises (each treatise complete in itself) in relation to individual man, to the family, to the nation, to the Son of God, to the church which he has founded, to the revelation which he has completed, and to the future prospects of humanity. Accordingly the principles which we have there seen holding their way through the successive kingdoms of primeval Nature, are here resumed, and are exhibited in their next and higher application to *individual man*."

"The laws of the Divine procedure are here distributed into three Parts, consisting of the end aimed at; the method of attaining it; and the reasons for the employment of that method."

With this description of his object by the author himself, those who admire Dr. Harris' previous works will be able to form a sufficient judgment of the character of the book before us. Its characteristics of thought and style, the order of ability which it displays and the general spirit and tone of the work, are precisely such as our previous acquaintance with Dr. Harris, led us to anticipate. It requires a very high order of logical power

and learning, conjoined with a spirit of the deepest reverence and humility, to execute properly the scheme projected in this series of treatises. And we cannot refrain from adding that the higher the degree in which these qualifications for the task exist in any given individual, the more we should think he would be likely to shrink from undertaking it.

**Memoir of Mrs. Eliza Astor Rumpff, and of the Duchess de Broglie, daughter of Madame de Staël.** By Rev. Robert Baird, D. D., American Tract Society.

**The Shaksperian Reader:** a collection of the most approved plays of Shakspeare; carefully revised, with Introductory and Explanatory Notes, and a Memoir of the Author, prepared expressly for the use of Classes, and the family reading circle. By John W. S. Hows, Professor of Elocution in Columbia College, N. Y. D. Appleton & Co., 200 Broadway, Philadelphia: Geo. S. Appleton, 164 Chestnut-st.

**Manual of Ancient Geography and History.** By Wihellm Pütz Principal Tutor at the Gymnasium of Düren, Translated from the German. Edited by the Rev. Thomas Trecheren Arnold, M. A., Rector of Lynden, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Revised and corrected from the London edition. New York, D. Appleton & Co., 200 Broadway. Philadelphia, G. S. Appleton, 164 Chestnut-st. pp. 396.

This is a remarkably condensed and combined view of the Geography and History of the Ancient World. The Author's plan may be learned from the following extract from the table of contents:

"The Egyptians.—Sources of information.—Geography of Egypt.—Name and Boundaries.—Soil and Climate.—Seas, Lakes and Rivers.—Natural Productions, Division.—Cities.—History of the Egyptians: 1. Fabulous Periods to the reign of Jesastris.—2. From Jesastris to the autocracy of Psammetichus.—3. From the reign of Psammetichus to the Persian conquest.—4. Egypt under Persian rule.—Religion of the Egyptians.—Constitution.—Sciences.—Art, &c."

Substantially the same method is pursued with regard to all Ancient Nations. That this plan is well executed, the origin and success of the work, are a sufficient guarantee. And that is excellent we presume every reader will at once admit.

**An Historical Geography of the Bible.** By Rev. Lyman Coleman, illustrated by maps, from the latest and most authentic sources, of various countries mentioned in the Scriptures. Philadelphia, E. H. Butler & Co., 1849.—pp. 489.

This book is what its name imports, an Historical Geography. The

author has brought together the results of modern researches in the department of sacred Geography, in connection with the historical events associated with such locality. The high scholarship of Dr. Coleman, opens to him the resources both of the oldest and latest Geographers, English and German. The maps have been carefully prepared from the latest authorities. The whole is concluded with a series of Indexes which give the volume all the advantages of a gazetteer. The book we look upon as meeting a pressing demand and as admirably suited to aid students of the Bible of all classes, as well teachers as scholars.

**The Elements of Reading and Oratory.** By Henry Mandeville D. D. Professor of Moral Science and Belles Lettres in Hamilton College. New York, D. Appleton & Co., 200 Broadway. Philadelphia, Geo. S. Appleton, 164 Chestnut Street.—pp. 352.

Reading and speaking are among the most important and yet the most neglected departments of education. It is indeed with them as with singing, excellence can be attained only by those who have peculiar adaptations. But as musicians say all may learn to sing correctly, so we believe all may be taught to read and speak with correctness. As with singing, however, so also with reading, what is done, must, in ordinary cases, be done early in life. It is, therefore, of great importance that this subject should command increased attention in all our educational institutions. This work of Dr. Mandeville is elaborate and philosophical, and has secured an established reputation.

**Cottage Lectures: or the Pilgrim's Progress practically explained.** Designed for Cottage and Family Reading. Philadelphia: American Sunday School Union. pp. 456.

This strikes us as an admirable book. There are thirty lectures on the principal points of Christian experience—entitled, The Awakening, Temptations to Draw back; The Mount Sinai, &c. &c.; all written in a plain, effective style and evangelical spirit. They were originally delivered by Rev. Charles Overton, vicar of Cottingham, England, and is recommended by the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Rev. Edward Bickersteth and other kindred spirits in the Church of England.

**A Treatise on Algebra for the use of Schools and Colleges.** By S. Chase, Professor of Mathematics in Dartmouth College. New York: D. Appleton, 200 Broadway. Philadelphia: Geo. S. Appleton, 164 Chesnut street. 1849. pp. 335.

**The Classic French Reader, for advanced Students: or the Beauties of the French Writers, Ancient and Modern.** By Alain De Fivas, Author of an Introduction to the French



Language. With a Vocabulary, French and English, of all the words and idioms contained in the work. By J. L. Jewett, Editor of Ollendorf's New Method of learning French. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 200 Broadway. Philadelphia: Geo. S. Appleton. 1849. pp. 388.

The Catechism Tested by the Bible. A Question Book on the Topics in the Assembly's Shorter Catechism; for Families, Sabbath Schools, Bible Classes, and Churches. By A. R. Baker. Sold by C. C. Dean, 13 Cornhill, Boston, and by other booksellers. pp. 160.

An attempt to promote the use or the comprehension of the admirable formula of doctrine given in the Shorter Catechism, is to be looked upon with favour. This work by Mr. Baker has come into hand just as the last sheet of our Journal is passing through the press. We can therefore only state that the plan of the work is under each question, with references to passages of Scripture suggesting or explaining the answer. The work seems to be executed in the spirit of the catechism, with the design to carry out and illustrate the doctrines there taught.

The Young Disciple; or a memoir of Anzonetta R. Peters. By Rev. John A. Clark, late Rector of St. Andrew's Church, Philadelphia. Abridged from the Fifth Edition. American Tract Society. pp. 230.

Narrative of the late Expedition to the Dead Sea, from a Diary by one of the party. Edited by Edward P. Montague. Phila. Cary & Hart, 1849.

Beneficence in Design in the Problem of Evil, vindicated by the laws of causation in the physical construction of matter. By a Journeyman. New York. Leavitt, Trow & Co., 1849.

An Autobiography and Letters, of the Author of "the Listener," "Christ our Law," &c. Phila. J. N. Moore, 1849.

The Remesis of Faith. By J. A. Froude. London. Svo. pp. 230.

The Heroes of Puritan Times, with an Introduction by Joel Hawes, D. D.

Gieseler's Compendium of Ecclesiastical History. From the Fourth Edinburgh Edition, Revised and amended. Translated by Samuel Davidson, LL. D.

Posthumous Works of the Rev. Thomas Chalmers, D. D. vol. VI. Harpers. New York. 1849.

- The Union of Church and State.** By the Rev. Baptist W. Noel. M. A. Harpers. 12mo. 1849.
- Man Primeval, or the Constitution and Primitive Condition of the Human Being.** Boston. 12mo. Gould, Kendall, & Lincoln.
- Bibliotheca Americana.** Catalogue of American Publications, including Reprints & Original Works, from 1820 to 1848 inclusive. 8vo. pp. 337. By O. A. Roorback.
- Hagenbach's Compendium of the History of Doctrines.** Translated by C. W. Buch. 2 vols. 8vo. London.
- Olshausen's Commentary on the Romans.** Translated by Clergymen of the Church of England. 1 vol. 8vo. London.
- A Visit to Monasteries in the Levant.** By the Hon. Robt. Curzon. New York. Geo. Putnam : London. John Murray. 1849.
- Collectanea Evangelica; or Selections from the Greek Testament.** By N. C. Brooks, A. M. 3d edition. A. S. Barnes, & Co. 1849.
- Remains of William S. Graham, with a Memoir.** Edited by George Allen, Professor in the University of Pa. Phila., J. W. Moore. 1849. 12mo. pp. 278.
- The Christian's Catechism a Lesson from the Old and New Testament, for the use of families and Sunday Schools.** By John L. Pray. 18m. pp. 76.
- Adventures in the Siberian Desert and the Oasis of Jupiter Ammon.** By B. St. John. 16mo. pp. 244. Putnam.
- Sermons, by the Rev. Dr. Chalmers; illustrative of different stages in his ministry, from 1798 to 1847.** Harpers.
- Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History, translated by Maclaine.** New Edition, continued to 1826, by C. Coote, LL. D. 2 vols. 8vo.
- Gospel Lessons, by Alexander Vinet, D.D.** M. W. Dodd, N. York.
- Sprinkling the only Mode of Baptism; by Abraham Peters, D.D.** M. W. Dodd. New York.
- A History of American Baptist Missions in Asia, Africa, Europe and America.** By W. Gammell, A. M. Boston. 1849.

Christ Receiving Sinners, by the Rev. John Cumming, D.D.  
Carter, New York. 1849.

The Catechetical Question Book, by Melancthon W. Jacobus.  
Matthew. Carter and Brothers.

This little volume is a suitable accompaniment to the author's truly useful commentary. It has this peculiarity, which merits the notice of Presbyterians, that it incorporates, in proper places, the whole of the Westminster Shorter Catechism. Mr. Jacobus's known learning, diligence, and orthodoxy give a stamp to all that proceeds from his study.

The Hill Difficulty, and some Experience of Life in the Plains of Ease; with other Miscellanies, by G. B. Cheever D.D.  
Wiley. 1849. pp. 383, 12mo.

Review of Dr. Bushnell's "God in Christ," by E. Pond, D.D.  
Boston. 1849.

Winer, Biblisches Realwörterbuch. 3d edition. 2 vols. Bonn.  
1848. R. Garrigue, N. Y.

Burmeister, Geschichte der Schöpfung. Leipzig. 1848. R.  
Garrigue. N. York.

A Discourse concerning the Divine Providence. By William  
Sherlock, D.D. Pittsburgh: J. C. Read.

A History of the Vaudois Church, from its origin, and of the  
Vaudois of Piedmont, to the present day. By Antoine Monastier, formerly Pastor in the Canton de Vaud. Translated from the French. New York: Lane & Scott.

Four Lectures on the Influence of the Fifth Commandment as  
the great principle of Love of Country, and Obedience to constituted authorities. By H. Alford. 8vo. pp. 72. London.  
1849.

Our Lord's Last Days on Earth; selected from the Evangelists;  
the Harmony taken from Chevalier Bunsen's Andachtsbuch.  
8vo. pp. 56. London.

Meditations from the Fathers of the first five centuries: arranged as Devotional Exercises on the Book of Common Prayer. 2 vols. 12mo. pp. 986.

The Four Gospels: A New Translation. By the Right Reverend F. S. Kenrick, D.D. (Romish) Bishop of Philadelphia, Dunigan: New York. 1849.

Narrative of the United States' Expedition to the River Jordan and Dead Sea; By W. F. Lynch, U. S. N., Commander of the Expedition. Svo. pp. 500. Lea & Blanchard. This is the official account of the expedition.

Historical and Descriptive Memoir of the Town and Environs of Jerusalem, (to accompany the Ordnance Survey.) By Geo. Williams. London. Svo. 1849.

History of England from the accession of James II. By Thomas Babington Macaulay, Vols. I. & II. London: Longmen, Brown, Green, & Longman. Reprinted by E. H. Butler & Co. Philadelphia. 1849. pp. 448, 448.

The first American reprint of Macaulay's History, having been disfigured by the substitution of the provincial orthography of a part of New England, for the established usage of the rest of the world, speaking English, the Philadelphia publishers with commendable zeal determined on an accurate reprint of the work as it issued from the London press. Mr. Butler has produced two of the handsomest volumes ever submitted to American readers for the low price of one dollar a volume.

Union to Christ. By R. Taylor, Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, Shrewsbury. New York: M. W. Dodd. 1849. 18mo. pp. 96.

Songs of Israel: A Chronological arrangement of the Book of Psalms. By one of the Laity. Liverpool. Svo. pp. 344.

Architectural History of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem. By the Rev. Robert Willis. London. 1849.

Practical Guide to the Greek Testament for those who have no knowledge of the Greek language. London.

A Collation of the principal English Translations of the Sacred Scriptures, with a historical account of the English missions, MSS. and Editions. By Charles Roger Dundee. 4to. London. 1849.

Scripture Metaphor, by the Rev. John Lindsay Adamson. Edinburgh. 1849. Svo.

A Letter of John Foster, on the Duration of Future Punishment; with an Introduction and Notes, and an earnest Appeal to the American Tract Society in regard to the character of its publications. 12mo. pp. 119. Phila. G. Appleton. (Universalist.)



## CONTENTS OF NO. III.

ART. I.—Annual Report of the Board of Missions of the General Assembly, of the Presbyterian Church, in the United States of America. Presented to the General Assembly, May, 1849. - - - - -	309
ART. II.—1. An Inquiry into the alleged Tendency of the Separation of Convicts, one from the other, to produce Disease and Derangement, by a citizen of Pennsylvania.	
2. Prisons and Prisoners, by Joseph Adshead.	
3. The Twentieth Annual Report of the Inspectors of the Eastern State Penitentiary of Pennsylvania. Transmitted to the Senate and House of Representatives, March, 1849.	
4. Report on the Condition of the New Jersey State Prison; embracing the Reports of the Joint Committee, Inspectors, Keeper, Moral Instructor, and Physician. Read January 16, 1849, and ordered to be printed.	
5. Annual Report of the Inspectors of State Prisons of the State of New York. Made to the Legislature, January 19, 1849. - . - - -	331
ART. III.—The Apostleship a Temporary Office. - - - - -	335
ART. IV.—Ignatius von Antiochen und seine Zeit. Sieben Sendschreiben an Dr. August Neander. - - - - -	378
ART. V.—The Calcutta Review. - - - - -	403
ART. VI.—The General Assembly. - - - - -	422
QUARTERLY LIST OF NEW PUBLICATIONS. - - - - -	457



THE  
PRINCETON REVIEW.

OCTOBER 1849.

---

No. IV.

---

ART. I.—*The Family of Arnould, as connected with Jansenism and Port-Royal.*

It was said by Royer-Collard, that not to know Port-Royal and its fortunes, is not to know the history of humanity. The most cursory student of church-annals, and of the Augustan age of France, is familiar with the names of Arnould, Pascal, Nicole, St. Cyran, Lancelot, Tillemont, Quesnel, De Sacy, Boileau and Racine; all connected in some degree with the houses of Port-Royal. This celebrated retreat was six miles from Paris and three from Versailles, at the left of the great road by Rambouillet to Chartres. The convent lay in so low a valley that it seemed to hide itself from the neighbouring places: the inmates used, however, somewhat to exaggerate the wildness of the scene, in order to a closer parallel with the Thebaid. It is important to be observed, that in addition to the abbey just mentioned, there was one of later date, under the same auspices, in the metropolis, called Port-Royal de Paris. Of the former, or Port-Royal des Champs, the traveller from Versailles to Chevreuse will find no remnant but a solitary Gothic arch; but he will recognise the hollow vale crossing the flats, and marked by

a languid brook, a mill, a dovecot, and, as some say, a number of trees so planted as to indicate the nave and transept of the church. The church of Notre Dame de Port-Royal dates as far back as 1204. The nuns here sequestered were Bernardines, and the foundation was sufficient for sixty. From this swampy narrow vale proceeded, under the later organization, some of the most signal influences which have ever gone out from the church of Rome; influences connected with a mighty effort at reform, a learned and persistent defence of cardinal evangelical doctrines, an unequalled assault on Jesuitism, connected even with the whole history of Reformed truth. And while we lament the errors and superstitions to which these persons adhered, and especially the extremities to which they were driven by their fear of being reputed Calvinists, we cannot but sympathize with the struggles, and avail ourselves of the arguments, and emulate the piety, of such men as Jansenius and Pascal. It would not be difficult to show, that the whole system of Jansenius and Port-Royal was suggested by Protestantism; into which, but for the persecutions of the time, it must have merged; but we propose to leave conclusions of this kind to be deduced by the reader, while we gather a few facts respecting the chief actors in the conflict.

If any one family was above all others concerned in the war against Loyola and his followers, it was the family of ARNAULD. Few names are more celebrated than that of Antony Arnauld, Doctor of the Sorbonne, the great scholastic combatant of his day, the censor of Descartes and Leibnitz, and the confessor and exile for Augustinian doctrine. But Antony was only one of a constellation of noble natures, all of one descent. They came from the rocks and valleys of mountainous Auvergne, on the west side of the Rhone.

HENRY ARNAULD, great-grand-father of the Doctor, and of the not less famous Angelique and d'Andilly, was descended from a line of noble ancestors. His son ANTONY DE LA MOTHE ARNAULD was the first of the family who removed to Paris, where he died in 1585, at the age of 101 years: he had been *auditeur des comptes* in the parliament of Paris, *procureur-general* for queen Catharine de Medicis. On the day of St. Bartholemew, he defeated, at the head of his servants, a band of assassins who were sent to slay him in his house. Antony de



la Mothe was the father of eight sons and four daughters; several of whom deserve our notice.

JOHN, the eldest, was a traveller, even to the Levant, and a stalwart champion, whose daring is celebrated by de Thou. After the murder of the Guises, he was Secretary of State to Henry III. His life is full of hair-breadth escapes, and his death was characteristic. He was holding out the fortress of Lesoux, against the League. A priest of the League, in that town, contrived, through a cellar, to introduce soldiers into the fort. The other commanders were slain, but John, who happened to be making the rounds with a party on the walls, threw himself with twenty-two men into a tower. Here they made defence until they had exhausted their ammunition; most were killed, and the enemy was preparing to spring a mine under the tower. A capitulation was proposed, but when John saw that the remnant, including his two brothers, were in safety, he cast himself sword in hand into the midst of the enemy, and fell pierced with twenty wounds.

ANTONY, the second son of Antony de la Mothe, and the father of the Doctor, was born in 1506, and died in 1619. He was unquestionably one of the greatest men of his day, and is so reputed, even among his Jesuit foes. It has been made a question whether he ever was a Protestant. That his father once was, and that he was reconciled to the Romish Church, is well known. Among a band of military brothers, he was the orator. He was Counsellor of State and General Advocate under Maria de Medicis, a place which he inherited from his father. In the great work of maintaining national rights, which pertained in that day to the singularly constituted French parliaments, Antony played an important part. He laid down, or declined, various lucrative offices, to devote himself to juridical labours. His epitaph, by his grandson Le Maistre, alludes to this.\* When in 1600, Charles Emanuel, Duke of Savoy, was entertained at court, the king resolved to introduce his guest to the Parliament, as "the most august senate of Europe." What followed was

\* *Passant, du grand Arnauld révere la memoire.  
Ses vertus à sa race ont servi d'ornement,  
Sa plume à son país, sa voix au parlement  
Son esprit a son siècle, et ses faits a l'histoire.  
Contre un second Philippe, usurpateur des lys,  
Le second Demosthène anima ses écrits, etc.*

characteristic of the times. The king summoned two of the parliament, to display before the duke their powers of argument and oratory; these were one Robert, and our Arnauld. Such engagements were as awakening in that day as a hunt or a duel, and the concourse was immense. His son d'Andilly was present, being eleven years old; he afterwards recorded that the prize was awarded to Arnauld. On another occasion, when he was chosen to pronounce a panegyric on La Tremouille, a noted warrior, his eloquence was so awakening that the Duke of Montpensier, a prince of the blood, half drew his sword, not knowing what he did, and, when the speech was ended, cried out, "Bring me to Mons. Arnauld, that I may embrace him; he so transported me, that I was well nigh beside myself, and thought I was in the battle-field." D'Andilly further relates: "One day I was standing on the tribune of St. Paul's church, with Hurault, archbishop of Aix, who was counsellor in parliament; my father was in the nave below. When Cospeau, bishop of Lizieux had ended a fine sermon, the archbishop said to me: "It must be owned that is good preaching; but if your father who is down there had been up in the bishop's place, he would have carried us all up with him into the pulpit. I remember I was judge when he made his great argument against the Jesuits, and he so took us out of ourselves, that we looked on one another, as not knowing where we were, impatient to pronounce that famous sentence of which the memory will never be lost in our history."

The speech, just alluded to, is classical in French and forensic literature, and is often cited as Arnauld's Philippic. The clergy of Paris, in 1594, after the entry of Henry IV. into the metropolis, united with the University in making complaint against the Jesuits, who were then moving heaven and earth to gain power in France, especially the control of education, but who were also odious to thousands for the regicide opinions which were ascribed to them; opinions the more alarming since the assassination of Henry III. The clergy were represented by Louis Dole, the University by Antony Arnauld. The discourse of Arnauld became known over all the continent, and was translated into Latin and all the chief languages. In the hundred years' conflict with the Jesuits, this speech was often called the "original sin of the Arnaulds."

The Jesuits craved a discussion with closed doors, before the king and parliament: but Arnauld protested that his voice should be heard in the four quarters of the kingdom. He was as good as his word, and uttered a volley of reasoning, scorn and fire, such as modern times has seldom known. Among other things, he played on the national pride. "A few years ago, said he, the Jesuits were forced to lurk in dark recesses, *pour rénarder*; now they are setting the realm on a blaze. The Jesuits are of Spanish origin; their founder was wounded while warring against France. Their chief vow is to render absolute obedience to their General, in all things: but this General is always a Spaniard, chosen by the king of Spain. Loyola was a Spaniard, Lainez a Spaniard, Everardus a Fleming, subject to Spain, Borgia a Spaniard, Aquaviva, the present General, a Neapolitan, subject to Spain. The terms of their fourth vow are frightful, for they recognise the present Christ in their General. If Christ should command to kill, he must be obeyed. If the General should command to kill the king of the French, he must be obeyed."

"O Henry the Third!" he breaks forth, in the spirit of ancient apostrophe, "O my noble king! who now from heaven lookest down, rejoicing that thy rightful heir, surrounded by six thousand nobles, makes his way over the bodies of his enemies, and thunders at the walls of the last rebel city; O Henry, stand by me in this trial of right, keep ever before my eyes thy bloody mantle. Give me strength and fire, to kindle in all thy subjects, pain, hate and courage, such as are due to the Jesuits; men who by their ungodly confessional, their fanatic preaching, their secret conspiracy with the emissaries of thy foe, the poisoning of thine own brother, have become involved in all the woes of this people and thy own murder."

In another place: "They tell us," says he, "the Jesuits teach the youth. What is it, I ask, that they teach the youth? They teach them to compass the death of our kings. We read in Dio, that Maecenas told Augustus, there was no surer method to secure himself and his successors, than to have the Roman youth educated by persons devoted to monarchy. For the world renews its inhabitants every few years, and those who are now in youth will soon occupy high places. So there can be nothing more perilous, than to have our youth taught by Spau-

ish spies, who above all things hate the greatness of French monarchy. Nothing is easier than to give a tinge to these weak and tender minds; nothing harder than to remove it. It was not the water of Eurotas, that made the men of Sparta warlike; it was the discipline of Lycurgus: it is not the Seine or Garonne that makes so many false Frenchmen, but the Jesuit Colleges at Paris, at Toulouse, and at Bordeaux. Since such scholars have risen to office, *majorum mores non paulatim ut antea, sed torrentis modo præcipitati sunt*. The Carthaginians offered their own children to Saturn: fathers and mothers were bound to stand by the sacrifice with a cheerful countenance. It is amazing, that we should have lived to see a time, when he is not esteemed a good Catholic, who does not send his children to the schools of the Jesuits."

ISAAC, the third son of Antony de la Mothe, was Intendant of Finance to Henry the Fourth. DAVID, BENJAMIN, CLAUDE and LOUIS, were four less distinguished sons. But PETER, the eighth and last son, cannot be dismissed so summarily, for the spirit of the eldest seemed to live again in him. He had, in 1611, an important part in the defence of Geneva, the bulwark of the Reformation. After this he connected himself with the armies of Gustavus Adolphus. Again we find him in France, and wounded at the siege of Caen in 1620. He was colonel, or *mestre de camp* as it was then called, of the old regiment of Champagne, in 1622, and distinguished himself before Rochelle. Many important changes in tactics and arms, under Louis XIII., are ascribed to Peter Arnauld. But the chagrin caused by an unsuccessful assault on Rochelle, and the exposure of two years in camp, destroyed his constitution, and he died in 1624. From his connexion with Geneva and with Gustavus Adolphus, we might suppose him to have been originally a Huguenot, as we know several of his brothers were; and the Jesuits were fond of casting in the teeth of the Arnaulds, this supposed opprobrium. Some of the sons of old Antony de la Mothe were secreted with him during the perils of the Bartholomew's Night, and some of them were grown up when he became a Papist. Still we cannot speak with certainty concerning Peter Arnauld, on a point which it was so much to the interest of the next generation to render obscure. Petitot, in his Memoirs, speaking of Claude, the above named sixth son, who was a soldier and at



one time treasurer-general, says: "I desired to see the tomb (behind St. Sulpice) of the late treasurer-general Arnauld, of which every one speaks as of a thing quite beautiful *among the Reformed*." The inscription is touching; after a few ordinary words:

*Moestissimo fratri  
plura non permisit  
Dolor.*

The family of Arnauld lived in much style, after their removal to Paris. Antony, the civilian, inherited from the Marions the estate of Andilly, from which his eldest son, to be spoken of below, took his name, agreeably to a French usage. Antony possessed also a house in Paris, which was afterwards occupied by his grandson Pomponne, minister of Louis XIV., the friend of Madame de Sévigné. Certainly Auvergne never made a more important gift to the metropolis; if we except Blaise Pascal, who was an Auvergnat, and who is almost to be numbered among the family of Arnauld. It is a curious fact, that the most able defender of the Jesuits against Port-Royal, Sirmond the Confessor of Louis XIII., was also a native of Auvergne.

So much for the third generation, of those whom we have named, to wit, the children of Antony de la Mothe-Arnauld. In respect to the fourth, we are concerned only with the sons and daughters of Antony the civilian and orator. These were ten in number and comprised the most distinguished Jansenists.

ROBERT ARNAULD D'ANDILLY, eldest son of Antony the scourge of the Jesuits, and of a daughter of the General Advocate Marion, was born in 1589, and died in 1674. "He was a man," said Balzac, "who possessed all the moral, and all the Christian virtues, without being proud of the former, or ashamed of the latter." He prepared for his son Pomponne those Memoirs which are a principal source of the history that engages us. His eldest son, Abbé Arnauld, the fourth Antony of the family, also left Memoirs. D'Andilly was a true descendant of the French knights-errant; all love and valour; a fiery yet melting temperament; clinging to his friends with passionate adherence, and contending for them to the outrance. "I believe," says he, "no son was ever reared in a closer friendship with a father, than was I: he had no secret for me, nor I any for him." He was educated at home, until at a certain time he was taken to

the house of his uncle Claude, who treated him with parental care. This good kinsman however died in 1602. It is he whose tomb was in the Reformed burial-ground. D'Andilly was taken very early to court, by his uncle Isaac, the Intendant, and used to stand behind the queen's chair. He was soon introduced to political and diplomatic life; but he was also drawn into camps, and followed the king in his wars against the Huguenots, to Rochelle, Montpellier, and Montauban. During the time of these wars, he became acquainted with the man, who after Jansenius, was of all others most influential in giving form to the system of Port-Royal; and in the following way. "Sebastian Bouthillier," we quote d'Andilly's own words, "afterwards Bishop of Aire, a man of great uprightness and worth, and much my friend, so that I believe he loved no one more than me, would often say to me, If ST. CYRAN and I ever meet you, I will make you a present beyond all price; for I will give him to you as a friend. This came to pass at Poitiers. The Bishop (*Monsieur Aire*, as the mode of calling bishops then was) took us both by the hand, and said to St. Cyran, to whom he had often spoken of me, 'This is d'Andilly,' and to me, 'This is St. Cyran.' He then left us together. These few words were enough; at that instant our friendship had its beginning, and continued so unbroken till his death, that there could not be a greater on earth. It would be superfluous to add, how distinguished were the piety and genius of this great person, who may without flattery be called one of the brightest luminaries that has enlightened the church in many ages."

D'Andilly was not only employed in the most confidential services by Louis XIII., but was admitted to singular personal intimacy. The following anecdote will show that this was without any sacrifice of his characteristic manliness. When the death of his uncle Peter Arnauld before Rochelle, in 1624, was reported, d'Andilly flew to the king, to obtain the vacant place for Feuquieres, the husband of Isaac Arnauld's daughter: but the king cut him short by saying that the place had already been given to another, who had indeed promised ten thousand crowns for it. "Ten thousand crowns!" exclaimed d'Andilly; "it would take seventy thousand to cover the disbursements of my uncle in your majesty's service, especially at Fort-Louis. But I seek not money; I am of a race accustomed to sacrifice

everything to your majesty's service. I only seek to procure this honour for one of the bravest noblemen of the kingdom." The king continued to say, that his decision was unalterable, when d'Andilly, full of indignation, replied: "I see perfectly, Sire, whence our misfortune comes; it is that my uncle was a subject of your majesty; had he been born a subject of Spain, and had he after great services, died intestate, his family would not have been unrewarded." The king made no reply, but never manifested any coolness.

In 1634, after a long period without public employment, being at his chateau of Pomponne, on the Marne, d'Andilly received sudden news of his appointment as Intendant of the army of the Rhine. It cost him some pain to break away from the circle of fashionable and literary ease in which he was now embosomed. A glance at the circumstances will serve not only to throw light on the manners of the age, but to show from what class of persons the chief personages in the Jansenian history were drawn. No man more enjoyed the elegancies of the time than d'Andilly. The circle to which he belonged was that which had its centre at the Hotel de Rambouillet, and which gave a European celebrity to that house. Here, in an age singularly devoted to ingenious pleasures, were every day convened the wittiest men and finest women of Paris. The contrast with his later ascetic years affords an apology for a relation which would otherwise be frivolous. One day when d'Andilly was at Pomponne, Madame de Rambouillet, in the exuberance of her hilarity, resolved to play off on him what would now be called a hoax. Among her retinue was Godeau, who little foresaw that he should one day be a princely prelate. Godeau was ludicrously small in person, so that he was nicknamed the Princess Julia's dwarf. Madame de Rambouillet, with a numerous cortège, set out from Paris for Pomponne, with two coaches. About five o'clock in the evening, two or three horsemen rode up to Pomponne, as if they were the quartermasters of a detachment, and gave notice of an approaching troop of cavalry. D'Andilly, unaccustomed to have such guests quartered on him, came out in some heat, and entered into minute inquiries. While he was thus solemnly engaged, a trumpet sounds; he descends to receive the company, when he is met by the dwarf (afterwards bishop of

Grasse and Vence) armed in antique fashion, who rushes upon him, charging him with a lance of straw. Such were the humours of the time, as we may abundantly learn from the letters of Voiture, de Sévigné, and Bussy-Rabutin. The Hotel Rambouillet in the fauxbourg St. Antoine was perhaps the first of those réunions, which exercised so great an influence on French manners and even on French letters and religion. Here, as at a literary Almacks, were gathered the aristocracy of taste and genius, of poetry and prose. Richelieu, the founder of the Academy, though sworn enemy of territorial aristocracy, endured this, as adding lustre to his throne. Here met Voiture, Balzac, and the Huguenot Ogier de Gombauld. Voiture especially seems to have been much attached to the Arnaulds; he celebrated Isaac Arnauld, the younger, in his poems, and dedicated a composition to Madame d'Andilly. There was much of the pedantic and fantastic in these assemblages, and their language was a euphuism, which would now be reckoned ridiculous; but all was gallant and chivalrous. The Abbé Arnauld, who was then in the King's Guards, tells of an *Ordre des Egyptiens*, over which, in 1635, one of his fair cousins presided, as queen, under the name of Epicharis. Godeau and d'Andilly both put spurs to their Pegasus, in this career. The Abbé Trublet and Mademoiselle de Scuderi published a code of spiritual love; the latter in the once famous *Clelie*. In this glorification of trifles and elaborate badinage, there were published in 1635 three academical discourses for and against love, on the question whether the ancients were justified in deifying this power. It is scarcely credible how far this influence extended. The most prominent members of the Academy, then recently founded, frequented this society. Here one might see the Condés, the brilliant duchess de Longueville, the heroine of the Fronde, afterwards a recluse of Port-Royal, and Madame de Sévigné; though the exquisite taste of this lady led her to revolt against the *niaiseries* of the place, so as to produce a schism. Never was female influence more potent than now in giving decisions on the drama, on poetry and on pulpit eloquence. The greatest authors were willing to bring hither the first fruits of their genius. Here, at the age of sixteen, Bossuet preached an extempore sermon, at eleven o'clock at night; which made Voiture say, he never heard any one preach either



so early or so late. Here the noted preacher Fléchier made his first attempts. The Hotel Rambouillet was the Exchange of the poets. Corneille and Moliere here first read some of their immortal works. The ladies of this circle called one another their *précieuses*, a word which then was only a fondling expression. But Moliere ridiculed, and made it imperishable, like straws in amber, in his *Précieuses Ridicules*; and Menage relates that being, at the first representation of this play, he said to Chapelain, a true servant of these ladies: "Believe me, sir, if I may use the words of St. Remigius to Clovis, We must burn what we have worshipped, and worship what we have burnt." The last stroke given to them, was in the *Femmes Savantes*, in 1672. La Bruyère reflects upon the enigmatic language which was then in vogue, and which was the offspring of neither taste nor wit, but only of shallow fancy and routine.

From such scenes d'Andilly went to the wars; from such scenes, at a later day, he went to the cell and haircloth. It is not our purpose to follow him through that famous campaign in Germany, which preceded the Peace of Westphalia. He was soon after bereft, first of his mother-in-law, Madame de la Boderie, and then of his wife. Two years after came the imprisonment and death of Feuquieres, and the death of his brother, at Verdun. From this time onward, the religious sentiments which he had long cherished, became more active. In his extant letters, we find fewer compliments and more piety. "Every letter, however brief," said he, "I now tried to season with at least a grain of salt." In 1642 he had a long illness, marked by a chasm in his correspondence. During the regency which followed the death of Louis XIII., the court showed much confidence in d'Andilly, and even liberated his bosom-friend, St. Cyran, from the prison of Vincennes. It deserves special notice, that d'Andilly, a man of honour, a soldier, and a courtier, made strenuous endeavours to abolish the practice of duelling; against which, at his instance, a decree of parliament was registered in 1642. He calls it a detestable practice, which robs God of soul and body, an offering due to him, and sacrifices them both to the devil. It was calculated that during the Regency alone, and therefore after this stringent law, no less than nine hundred and eighty persons of rank fell in duels.

His influence at court was still secure. On one occasion the queen said to him, "You were much attached to St. Cyran?" "I was under such obligations to him," replied he, "that I loved him more than my life. But he bound me still more nearly to him in his death, by bequeathing to me his heart; which I prize more than ——" the queen, who held by the hand the young prince, afterwards king Louis XIV. completed the sentence, by laying her hand on the boy, and saying, "more than *this*;" that is, more than royalty itself.

St. Cyran, in his testament, had enjoined on d'Andilly to go into seclusion. It was the superstition of the age; yet amidst every corruption, we cannot but discern gleams of something nobler, as in the following passage, which is affecting even in its errors: "I cannot enough thank God," says d'Andilly, "for hearing the prayer of my mother, a true Christian woman, whose request was that He would overturn the temporal prosperity of her children, and found eternal good on its ruins. And, to view the matter with the eye of faith, what family was ever more happy! Of twenty children, borne to my father by this excellent woman, ten died in innocent infancy, and are therefore safe for eternity. Of the remaining ten, six have closed their lives in the holy house of Port-Royal, or will yet do so. Of four remaining brothers, two, namely, the Bishop of Angers and the Doctor of Sorbonne, are in the narrow way, fighting the good fight, and thus prepared with God's help, one day to receive the crown from his hand. I have hope also, that God has had mercy on my third brother, who fell at Verdun; and, great sinner as I am, his infinite mercy makes me hope from him the same grace, through the merit of the blood which my Saviour shed upon the cross. Of the fifteen children that God has given me, five died in the age of innocence; three of my six daughters, who became nuns in Port-Royal, have died a holy death; and I cannot enough praise God, that the remaining three are following in their steps. The last of my four sons, who died in the army very young, was reared in so Christian a manner, that I have reason to hope that God took him from this world to preserve him from corruption. The son who is my companion in solitude, preceded me in renouncing this world, in the hope of that which is to come."

D'Andilly is numbered among the illustrious men of the

seventeenth century, by Perrault, who says of him: "When quite young he was thought at court deserving of the highest offices. Still later, he discharged several of the most important trusts with much ability and the most conscientious uprightness. His manner of dealing with princes was peculiar. For as he had a large heart, a lofty spirit, and all the dignity that accompanies a commanding presence, joined with a well-grounded reputation and consummate wisdom, he spoke to them with great freedom, which being accompanied with circumspection, was always pleasing to them."

These particulars in the former life of a leading Jansenist will add interest to his subsequent course. At the age of fifty-five, he abandoned public life, and retired to the abbey of Port-Royal des Champs. Here, during a seclusion of thirty years, he wrote the works which establish his reputation, and which fill eight folio volumes. These are chiefly lives of the Saints, or translations from the Fathers. All are remarkable for that classical purity and elegance of style which distinguish whatever proceeded from Port-Royal, as well as for elevated sentiment and unction. He died in 1674.

CATHARINE, the eldest daughter of Antony Arnauld became the wife of Isaac Lemaistre, and was afterwards a nun. She is chiefly remarkable for her distinguished children, whom we shall have to name below.

ANGELIQUE, the second daughter of Antony Arnauld, who was born in 1591 and died in 1651, was in many respects the most distinguished person of her race; certainly according to the Romish standard of judging. It will be necessary to condense into a small space the copious materials towards her biography which are before us, and which if fully detailed would give a lively picture of monastic life in France, and of the power of this system to hem in and warp the most generous natures. And that the story may be as little broken as possible, we shall connect with Angelique her sister AGNES, who was born in 1593, and died in 1653. Angelique is the central point in the history of Port-Royal. The children of the great orator and lawyer seem to have been divided into two classes as to temperament; one having the fire of the Arnaulds, the other the equanimity of the Marions; to one class belonged d'Andilly, Catharine le Maistre, and Angelique, to the other the

Bishop of Angers, Agnes, and Anne Eugenie. Both Arnauld and Marion had been champions for Henry IV.; and Marion received by royal brevet the abbey of Port-Royal and St. Cyr, for his two infant granddaughters, Angelique and Agnes. What a glimpse it gives us of French popery and monkery, to read that Agnes was made superior of St. Cyr, at the age of five years! It was a period in which religion had become a play, and much amusement was afforded by the little *Madame de St. Cyr*. In the following year she became a nun. The other abbey had an abbess, and Angelique was made her coadjutrix. Let us hear some of her own expressions: "My father," says she to her nephew, the well known Le Maistre, "asked me when I was seven years old, whether I would not be a nun. As he feared I would say No, and as I did not well know what it meant, he anticipated me by saying: But you shall be something more than a mere nun, my child; I will make you abbess, and mistress of the others. I felt that I must submit to him, and finding the hard lot somewhat alleviated by the abbacy, I replied, Yes, grandpapa, I will. At the same time, my heart was almost broken, *je crevais*, and I went into the corridor, thinking with myself, Am I not unlucky to be born the second daughter! Had I been the eldest, I might have been married." Angelique was of an indomitable will, and early displayed her faculty of ruling others. So far as she came to the knowledge of gracious doctrine, she contended for it, at all hazards; so far as she was bound in the fetters of popery, she gloried in them, with a bigoted resolution. There was no submission or penance which she was not willing to undergo; and when in later years she became familiar with the system of Augustine, she found in the highest points of predestination and sovereign grace the means of subduing her rebellious will. This, however, is anticipating our story. For a time, the little girl was entrusted to the nuns of Maubuisson, a convent on the Oise. In 1600 she was taken to Amiens, where she went through the ceremony of confirmation. While at Maubuisson she made her *profession*, as it is called. When in 1662, the abbess of Port-Royal died, Antony Arnauld lost not a moment in carrying his child to take possession of her benefice; to this dignity she was raised at the age of ten years and ten months. The same day she first partook of the eucharist, and as she says, without



any instruction in its meaning. The Pater who confessed the nuns did not so much as know the paternoster in French; he opened no book but his Breviary, but spent his time in hunting. Such was the priesthood, during the wars against the Huguenots. There had been preaching seven or eight times in forty years. During the carnival no one communicated, as the nuns were masquerading in the convent; the Pater was meanwhile doing the same with the servants. The foundation had been dilapidated; in 1605 there were but twelve nuns. Angelique was a lively child; she read the Lives of Saints with less zest than Plutarch, which was then the favourite book in France. Henry IV. being on a hunting expedition, visited the abbey, desiring to see "the little abbess;" he found her taller than he expected, which was no wonder, as she wore heels several inches high. While yet at a distance, the gallant king sounded his bugle, and cried, when the nuns flew to the window, "I kiss the hands of the Lady Abbess."

During the succeeding years the young abbess passed through many stages of inward conflict, such as under other influences might have led her to the clearest protestantism. Amidst much that was good, her zeal expended itself very much in externals, and especially in plans for reforming the abbey, and introducing a stricter rule. This reform she began with herself, by voluntary humility and macerations. At night she often went secretly to a loft, in order to pray. She was sometimes seen dropping melted wax on her arm. Having been taught by a new confessor, that the house should according to rule be closed, even against her nearest friends, she once held out against her father and his family, as if in a beleaguered castle, conversing only through the grate; by which old Arnauld was highly exasperated. It shows the firmness of a girl of eighteen. The day was in after years referred to, as *la journée du guichet*, or the day of the grate. In later life, she used to record many of the instances of laxity in the nunneries and their confessors. In her apology for going out of the order of Cîteaux, she says: "If the abbesses are proud, the confessors are their humble servants, their valets de chambre. This is so true, that I saw one sowing beets, so as to make the abbess's name and cipher; and another holding up the abbess's train, as lackeys are used to do. If, on the other hand, the abbesses are humble and entertain a

reverence for the priesthood, the confessors become masters and tyrants, so that nothing can be done without their orders. When such friars go back to their proper monasteries, they are intolerable, having become imperious from ruling over women." Angelique (says Reuchlin) gives us a list, we might say a *menagerie*, of Confessors, of whom some were wolves, some foxes, and some boobies. Selfishness and jealousy were their common faults.

After her father's death, which occurred when she was about twenty-eight years of age, Angelique was summoned for a time to take charge of the nunnery of Maubuisson, in which she had spent part of her childhood. Its abbess was Madame d'Etrées, a sister of *la belle Gabrielle*, Henry's famous Mistress. This was by no means an austere abbey. The nuns used often to go, by water, with the prioress at their head, to a place agreed on, there to dance on the green with their holy brethren of St. Martin in Pontoise. Louis XIII. determined to reform these and many the like abuses, and caused several sets of commissioners to be sent on that errand; they found they had to do with a refractory amazon. A priest was sent to take up his abode, and bring things to rights. The ladies locked him up, with all his attendants, in a tower, and kept them four days on bread and water, with the addition of a daily strapping, *etrivières*. The abbey was at length evacuated only by a band of archers, the municipal guard of that day. They found the lady-abbess concealed in a chest or wardrobe, and carried her half-dressed upon a bed to Paris. Into her place, Angelique was brought. She found the nuns free from all government. Till this time they had been on the best terms with the young fellows of the country, living as if in a gay chateau. Some of them had gardens of their own, with pavilions, where they received company. Plays were acted. The abbey was rich enough to support a hundred nuns, and contained but twenty-two. It was only by force of arms, like what was common in feudal ejections, that the young superior was installed into her new place.

In 1620 Agnes Arnauld was made coadjutrix of Port-Royal. It was about this time that the sisters became acquainted with that famous saint and mystic, Francis de Sales. With him and with Berulle and St. Cyran, these ladies held many conversations on the corruptions of the church, which might well

have befitted Protestants. Like all Jansenists, they were contending for sovereign decrees, absolute grace, and inward vital religion as distinguished from forms. Their misery was that they sought this while subjecting themselves to the Bishop of Rome. St. Vincent says in a letter: "St. Cyran said to me one day, 'God has given me great manifestations, and still gives them. He has caused me to learn that there has been no church for these five or six hundred years. Formerly the church was a great stream of clear water, but now the church is only mire and mud: the bed of the stream is the same; but it is no longer the same water.'" I represented to him that all the heretics used the same pretext to cover their errors, and I especially named Calvin. 'Calvin,' said St. Cyran, 'was not wrong in all he undertook; but he defended himself ill.'

Angelique spent her life in her several religious houses, but chiefly in Port-Royal des Champs, in trying to realize the impracticable scheme of a conventual heaven on earth. None could be more sincere, devout, or energetic; but she attempted all by means of rigours. It is not our purpose to trace the progress of her reforms; when complete, they comprised a variety of ascetic observances. Property was common, animal food was tabooed. The coarsest clothes were worn, not to speak of *cilices* and pricking girdles. The nuns rose to matins at three o'clock. Absolute silence was observed, except in devotion, or certain prescribed conferences. Some hours were devoted to labour every day. The psalter was wholly said or sung every twenty-four hours. And at length, in pursuance of their special aim as nuns of the Holy Sacrament, and doubtless to stop the mouths of the Jesuits who twitted them with Calvinism, they so divided themselves, that at least one of them was at every moment of the day and night kneeling in adoration before the idol-wafer.\* Angelique was the leading spirit in all this, but Agnes followed her step by step.

In 1623 Angelique came back with thirty nuns from Maubuisson to Port-Royal des Champs. In 1626 there were eighty-four nuns at Port-Royal de Paris; and a number of other monasteries began to reform themselves after the same pattern. Agnes wrote a book of devotions, famous as the *Chapelet secret*

\* Ranke; History of Popes, p. 285.

*du St. Sacrement*, a rosary or series of enthusiastic prayers, addressed to Christ as transubstantiated in the mass; it contained sixteen articles, answering to the sixteen attributes of Christ in the sacrament. These devotions are transcendently mystical, yet not without a tincture of genuine love for the Saviour, whom their absurd idolatry was offending and mocking. The reigning ideas throughout are God's predestination, man's total inability, the all-sufficiency of grace, and love to Christ, as the essence of religion. This *chapelet* led to extraordinary assaults and to a censure by the Sorbonne. It was laid before Jansenius, who approved it; which marks a great epoch, as this was the bond of union between Jansenius and Port-Royal.

St. Cyran and several recluses had settled themselves at Port-Royal des Champs; the beginning of the male sodality there. St. Cyran was the great man of his day, the devoted friend of d'Andilly, the companion of Jansen's Augustinian studies, and the legislative mind of Port-Royal. It was he who introduced that devout and thorough reading of the Scriptures which characterised the sect, leading within those walls to such commentaries as that of Quesnel, and such translations as those of de Sacy and Le Maistre.

The widow of Antony Arnauld took the veil, and called Angelique, her own daughter, by the name of Mother: "making the word of God of none effect through their traditions." We have no space to record the romantic history of St. Cyran's arrest and imprisonment. As they were carrying him off to Vincennes, he was met by d'Andilly, on his way to Pomponne. "Whither are you taking all these people?" asked d'Andilly. "It is I, whom am taken by them," said St. Cyran; "but I am less the prisoner of man than of God. They have not given me time even to take a book." D'Andilly handed him the Confessions of Augustine: they embraced and parted. In that prison St. Cyran first received and read the *Augustinus* of his lately deceased friend; which he called the Devotion-book of these last days. It would prove too strong meat for many a nominal Calvinist, defending as it does unconditional election, total depravity, and definite atonement.\* John Von Wert, a German general, taken prisoner, was brought to the

\* See a remarkable chapter of the '*Augustinus*,' on this last topic.



same castle. While there he was entertained by Richelieu with a comedy and ballet; upon which he observed, that nothing so much struck him in France, as to see bishops at comedies and saints in gaol. St. Cyran lived but a short time after his liberation. On his death-bed he said to his medical attendant, who was also a Jesuit: "Tell the fathers, not to triumph when I am dead, for I leave twelve behind me, mightier than I."

In 1627 Angelique took the bold step of forsaking the Cistercian order, apparently because it was impossible to carry out her rigid plans under its rule. In 1629 or 1630 she ceased to be abbess, and was succeeded by Genevieve de Tardif, who held it till 1636, after which it was held six years by Sister Agnes; who in 1642 again gave place to Angelique. The sisters occupied this post alternately, for nearly thirty years. During this period, the colloquies in their house were enlivened by the Cartesian controversy, and by the presence of Pascal. There was still visible, as late as 1805, a hydraulic engine, erected by Pascal at Port-Royal.

It would be aside from our design to give an account of the controversy concerning the doctrines of Molina and Jansenius, which filled all mouths at Paris, and gave origin to the Provincial Letters. These controversies agitated the recluses of Port Royal, who were devoted Augustinians. Their course would have been as simple as that of Luther or Zwingli, if they could have rid themselves of subjection to Roman infallibility. But they received the papal decree as the voice of God, and the pope had condemned certain propositions, as being in Jansenius, and subscription was demanded from the recluses to a formula, bearing not only that the propositions were erroneous, but that they were in Jansenius. Hence the distinction concerning the pope's infallibility touching *matters of fact*. The best commentary on this is furnished by the Provincial Letters. The bull of Innocent X. which condemned the Five Propositions of Jansenius, bore date May 30, 1653; the year in which, after long absence, Angelique returned to Port-Royal des Champs. At this time there were resident four priests and twenty-five lay brothers. During these years of anxiety, when the whole storm of Jesuit rage and court disfavour was breaking over them, and when these poor misguided but sincere women were often

in extreme perplexity, between their convictions of truth and their allegiance to Rome, it should seem that Angelique persisted in her heroic part. Both she and Agnes encouraged the sisters in believing that they were now honoured by resemblance to the ancient confessors. Angelique was approaching the season of old age, and was most of the time ill. By royal authority the clergy were summoned in 1660 to condemn Jansenism. Next year there was a formal inquisition into Port-Royal des Champs, resulting in the compulsory removal of all the boarders, novices, and nuns; the nuns were dispersed, two and two, into other convents. Two days after this deportation, Angelique, now approaching her end, wrote to one of the recluses, the chevalier de Sévigné, brother-in-law of the celebrated Madame,\* "At length God has stripped us of all; he has taken the fathers, the sisters, the children. Blessed be his holy name! There is pain indeed; but with peace and entire submission to the divine will. We are persuaded that this visitation is a great mercy of God towards us, that it was needful for us, to purify us, and enable us to profit by so many graces received. Believe me, if God in his grace has purposes of greater compassion, the persecution will go still further." She was sinking under the dropsy, and for many weeks could escape suffocation only by being perpetually in a sitting posture. Meanwhile, it was a part of her religion, to let no complaint pass the door of her lips. She died August 6, 1661; the year of Mazarin's death. The enemies of Port-Royal were laying the axe at the root of the tree when its head fell. The reflections of Hermant, Bishop of Beauvais, might have been uttered by a Wesley or a Zinzendorf: "Enemies may pounce upon and carry away the simple doves, but cannot prevent them from fleeing to the opened side of the Redeemer; that opened side which he displayed to the unbelieving apostle, and which will not be shut against his true brides." Angelique and Agnes had been long united, though greatly differing. Angelique was bold, commanding, of magical influence, yet self-denying and affectionate. Agnes was mild, uniform, dignified and wise. She was called the "female theologian." Angelique, the founder of the reformed Port-Royal, was devoted to ascetic macerations;

\* And not, as Sir J. Stephen oddly imagines, to Madame de Sévigné herself.

Agnes was the mystic; anticipating many of those views which were afterwards celebrated, by connexion with Madame Guion and Fénelon; though the Port-Royal mysticism was far purer in its doctrinal basis, and free from the absurd claims to sinless perfection. Agnes held the spiritual reins for several years after her sister's death; her own death occurred in 1671. It would be easy to fill our pages with anecdotes of these extraordinary women; but this is forbidden by the pressure of other materials.

The fifth child of Antony Arnauld, ANNE EUGENIE, *de l'Incarnation*, born 1594, became a nun in Port-Royal in 1618, and died in 1653.

The sixth child, HENRY (de Trie) ARNAULD, born in 1597, was consecrated bishop in 1649, and died in 1692. Henry was more than all the rest in public affairs, through his long life. He was first abbé of St. Nicholas, and then bishop of Angers. While he was a law student, Francis de Sales prophesied that he would enter the church. He was always resident, which was not the fashion of a day when gay prelates used to be most of the time at court. During the years 1645, 1646, 1647, and 1648, he was employed at Rome, and other Italian courts, in the most important and confidential negotiations. In consequence of his success, a medal was struck in honour of him. When he was made bishop, his sister Angelique was so fearful of his being unequal to such a spiritual burden, that she absented herself from the pomp of consecration, and lay prostrate in prayer for her beloved brother. He was a friend to the friendless, and it was proverbial in Angers (as of Cranmer) that the best recommendation to Mons. Angers was to do him an ill turn. The only business which, during forty-four years, removed him from his diocese, was connected with the reconciliation of the Prince of Tarentum with the Romish church. It was an age of propagandism. The lust of power, which led Louis the Great to aim at governing Europe, led him to purpose uniformity of religion. The Huguenots were the Mordecai at his gate. Hence missions, and *conferences*, as certain popular debates were called, which filled up the space between the Bartholomew's gladiatorship, and the dragonnades of Louis. Hence, in the memoirs and letters of the time, as much is made of a great conversion, like Turenne's, as of a

successful siege in the Low Countries. All parties were vocal with such topics, and Madame de Sévigné nimbly and gracefully skips from a masquerade at Versailles, to a *belle passion*, or Good-Friday-sermon, at Notre Dame, or a conversion from Protestantism at Lyons. The great points were discussed in vast assemblies. The Cardinal of Lorraine won as many laurels in such conferences, as the Lorraine captains against Protestant armies in the field. People assembled at these conferences, as in old times at tournaments. Just as there were jousting and single combats, during truces, between crusaders and infidels, so in this deceitful peace, there were conferences between the 'church' and the 'religion,' as men called the Papists and the Reformed. Cardinal de Retz tells of a disputation which he held, before he was coadjutor, with a famous minister, at Charenton, the centre for the Parisian Huguenots. The zeal of Madame de Rambure, a zealous protestant, led to a combat of nine days. "The Marshal de la Force and Turenne, (says de Retz) attended for three or four days. A nobleman of Poitou, who sat out the whole, was converted. As I was but twenty-six years old, I gained much notice by this conversion. I must, however, do justice to the firmness of my adversary, Mestresot, in this debate. 'The fifth day, I had some advantages over him; we were upon the article of Vocation. But in return, he brought me into some trouble on the sixth, when the authority of the pope was touched. As I did not wish to break with Rome, I plied him with principles which are not so easily defended as those of the Sorbonne; [or the Gallican doctrines]. He replied to me: "It would not be right to keep the Abbé de Retz from being a cardinal.'" The finest court-ladies were prominent in the assemblies of the Cardinal de Guise. One of the most celebrated debates was that between John Claude and Bossuet, in March, 1678; published by Bossuet in 1682. This was brought about by Madame de Duras, and was attended by her brother, the Marshal. She went over to popery; indeed these public arguments were used as a splendid apology to cover many a retreat from the unpopular side. It was held no disgrace for a fair Huguenot to fall by the hand of a Bossuet.

The connexion of the Bishop with Port-Royal was only incidental and advisory; we shall, therefore, pass from him to others of his race.



MARIA DE STE. CLAIRE, the sixth child of the anti-Jesuit Demosthenes, was a nun in Port-Royal. SIMON, the eighth, fell at Verdun, a captain, in 1639. MADELAINE DE STE. CHRISTINE, the ninth, was a nun in Port-Royal. ANTONY ARNAULD, the tenth and youngest, and by far the most widely known of the race in theology and letters, is now to engage our attention.

Antony Arnauld, Doctor of the Sorbonne, was born February 6, 1612, and died August 8, 1694. He began the study of the Law, but by the advice of his mother, 'the mother of the Maccabees,' as she was called, was persuaded to devote himself to theology, and attended the exercises of the Sorbonne. At this early period he differed from his teachers, and avowed those doctrines of grace, which his enemies loved to stigmatize as Calvinistic. It is therefore only in a restricted sense that he can be called a follower of Jansenius, as he had never heard of Jansenius when his creed was formed. He became a priest in 1641. The celebrity of Arnauld arose from the publication in 1643 of his work on *Frequent Communion*, which at once embroiled him with the Jesuits. It was the object of this book to prove that the sacrament should not be administered in a perfunctory or mechanical manner; that it is not to be relied on, as if the effect were *ex opere operato*; that mental preparation is necessary; and that not only *attrition*\* (as the schoolmen and Jesuits teach) but *contrition*, should precede absolution and communion. Though the Jesuits were not named in this work, they at once felt themselves struck at. Aspiring to be the universal confessors, and to make the terms for penitents as easy as possible, they everywhere prescribed the sacraments as valid from the mere outward act. A little fear of hell, or attrition, was the only prerequisite. They were therefore offended by any semblance of more evangelical teaching. When some one expressed wonder to d'Andilly, that a man only thirty years of age should write such a book, he replied: "Why should you wonder? he only utters the language of the family." The pure diction and alarming eloquence of Arnauld made his preaching formidable to many troubled consciences in Paris. The Jesuits saw that their craft was in danger, and engaged their most famous writers to refute the treatise on Frequent

\* The famous article of Mr. (now Professor Sir J.) Staphen, in the Edinburgh Review, confounding the two words, misses the very gist of the controversy.

Communion. The kingdom was moved, and at Rome all the machinations of the Order were active to procure a condemnation of the book. But in spite of all their efforts, it passed uncensured, and Alexander VII. even expressed approval of the doctrine. The Abbey of Port-Royal as such had no part in these polemics, and it may require explanation, how it came to fall under the odium of the Jesuits. Doctor Arnauld was brother of the Mother Angelique. There were in the convent his mother, six sisters, and six nieces; when admitted to priest's orders he had made over his property to Port-Royal, intending to make it the place of his eventual retreat, where he might be with his eldest brother, d'Andilly, and his two learned nephews, Le Maistre and de Sacy. Above all, they and he were descendants of the advocate Antony Arnauld, and so bore the guilt of the philippic of 1594.\*

The Jesuits did not however obtain a fair occasion against the Doctor, until the publication of his two letters to the duke de Liancourt. This nobleman had been denied absolution, unless on condition of his removing a little granddaughter from Port-Royal. From the second of these letters, two propositions were extracted for condemnation. These letters came just in good time for the Jesuits. In one of them, Arnauld said, that, having carefully perused the Augustinus of Jansenius, he did not find in it the *five propositions* condemned by the pope. These five propositions constituted the very Sibboleth of the parties. This assertion of Arnauld was his first error; it related to fact. The second related to dogma, and was that the fathers represent to us, in the case of Peter, a justified person, to whom grace, without which we can do nothing, was in a certain instance wanting. The condemned points of Jansenius, the Five Propositions, were for substance as follows: 1. Some commandments of God are impracticable by the righteous; and sometimes even when they attempt obedience, the needed grace is wanting. 2. No man ever resists inward grace, in the state of nature. 3. In order to moral accountability, it is not necessary to be free from inward necessity, but only from outward constraint. 4. The Semipelagians admitted the necessity of an inward, prevenient grace, in order to every good act, and even

\* Racine, p. 324.

to the reception of faith; but they were herein heretical, that they required this grace to be such as the will of man can yield to, or resist, indifferently. 5. It is semipelagian doctrine, to say that Christ died, or shed his blood, for all men. These propositions were condemned and anathematized by the pope: these propositions, said Arnauld and the Port-Royalists, are not found in Jansenius. Here issue was joined on the question of the pope's infallibility in regard to a matter of fact. From this moment Doctor Arnauld, as the leading champion of Augustinianism, became the mark for every Jesuit arrow. In 1656 the Faculty of Theology condemned the two errors of Arnauld, and excluded him from the said faculty. For many years, he was either in retirement, at Port-Royal and Paris, or wandering under changes of name in the Low Countries, constantly sending forth from his retreat those works of powerful scholastic ratiocination which made him the dread of the Sorbonne and of Rome. The same epoch is marked by the censure of Arnauld and the appearance of the Provincial Letters; in several of which Arnauld aided Pascal. We appeal to a master when we cite Racine on a point of French style: "To these religious quarrels between the Jesuits and the Port-Royalists," says he, "there was added a pique of scholars. The Jesuits had been long in possession of the first rank in literature, and scarcely any books of devotion were read but theirs. It touched them sensibly therefore to see themselves dispossessed of this first rank, by newcomers, before whom all their genius and all their knowledge seemed to disappear. The Jesuits, instead of ascribing the happy success which attended the books of their adversaries to the goodness of the cause which they upheld, and the purity of the doctrine maintained, directed their attention to a certain elegance of language which they had before reproached as inconsistent with Christian simplicity. They have since made a particular study of this very elegance; but their books, wanting unction and solidity, have not been any better received by the public, for being written with a grammatical precision which goes the length of affectation." Some judgment may be formed of the effect produced on the world of taste by the consummate style of Port-Royal, when we find Madame de Sévigné writing as follows, concerning Nicole's

book on Morals, and when we remember that Nicole, though severely elegant, is the least imaginative and most rigid of these casuists. "The first volume," says she, "is marvellously delicious."—"I am hurt, as are you, with the *enflure de cœur*: this word *enflure* displeases me. As to the rest, have I not told you it is of the same stuff as Pascal? But this stuff is so beautiful that it always pleases me. Surely the human heart was never so anatomized as by these gentlemen."—"I read M. Nicole with a pleasure which carries me away; above all am I charmed with the third treatise on Peace with Men.\* Read it, I pray you, with attention, and see how nicely he shows the human heart, and how all persons whatever see themselves there, philosophers, Jansenists, Molinists and all."—"There is not a word too much or too little."

If we were writing the history of Port-Royal, it would be required of us to give an account of the persecutions to which the inmates both male and female were subjected for more than twenty years, or till the pacification in 1668. Various as were the fortunes of this period, in truth an Iliad of conflict, the source of the trial was one. All the religious of Port-Royal, including the simplest nuns and novices, were required to sign a formula, assenting to the pope's condemnation of the Five Propositions. Many substitutes were proposed, many attempts were made to substitute forms, by which the distinction of fact and of doctrine might be preserved. But all in vain; the inquisitorial sword was driven to the hilt; punishments of the severest sort, not only imprisonment but the interdict of the eucharist, were inflicted. There were diversities of judgment as to the lawfulness of subscription, and two even of the Arnaulds fell from their steadfastness; but Doctor Arnauld, though subtle beyond most men in distinctions, could never bring himself to forsake Augustine, to condemn Jansenius, or to purchase the privilege of going at large among his countrymen. The seclusion however was far from being unfruitful. The Jesuits knew this so well, that they described Port-Royal as a place where forty sharp pens were at work, all pointed by Dr. Arnauld. Among these were Pascal, Le Maistre, and de Sacy.

\* This admirable treatise is republished separately, Paris, 1847, 12mo. Didot frères.



Angelique herself was a host. The great work on the *Perpetuity of the Faith*, which we continue to see in the book-stores in cheap Paris editions, was laboriously produced during this period, by Arnauld and Nicole. In some of his distinctions respecting subscription, Arnauld seems to have been more lax than Pascal, though both were perfectly frank in their avowal of doctrine. In regard to the controversies between them, it is surprising to find Racine saying: "Arnauld smote Pascal's tenet to the earth, at a blow; for Pascal was small compared with Arnauld." Part of the time of persecution Arnauld and Nicole, who were inseparable in labours, lived in the rue St. Avoie, or in the neighboring Chatillon; observing the hours and devotions of monastic life. The duchess de Longueville, one of the most brilliant converts from luxury and courtly vice, gave Arnauld a refuge at the Hotel d'Epemon, in 1666. When the cruel blow of withholding the sacraments was inflicted on the poor devotees, Arnauld addressed to them counsels, which show the turn of his mind: "I am well aware that the piety of our day resides more in sense than in faith; and that it is never content, except when actually receiving the sacrament; and that it is not free from trouble and anguish, when this is removed. Your enjoyment would however be more tranquil, if you would bear in mind, what one of the most celebrated writers of our time, esteemed as one of the most illustrious for his piety, has said publicly, that we should found ourselves on those things which cannot be taken away against our will, and not on those of which temporal power and the opposition of this world may despoil us. The sacraments are good, but the ordinance of God is better. If, according to the scripture, obedience is better than sacrifice, it is also far better than sacraments, which are inferior to sacrifice; and you ought to be persuaded that He, when he takes you from the sacrament, gives you occasion to serve him more perfectly, than when he vouchsafed the free use of them. Hunger and thirst after the heavenly bread is doubtless good, and is a sign of soundness and inward strength of soul. But sacraments, and even the eucharist, properly speaking, are not this heavenly bread, but only means of obtaining it. Otherwise we should be satisfied after the communion, and would need to have no more hunger and thirst, whereas the true effect of the communion is increase of hun-

gering and thirsting after the bread of heaven and after the water of the Holy Ghost, which properly is the soul's food and flesh, according to Christ's words in the gospel. Moreover, it is written, not that they are blessed, who hunger and thirst after the eucharist and other sacraments, but they who hunger and thirst after righteousness, that is, after God himself and his Holy Spirit, which is far above all sacraments and sensible things, and above all gifts that are not God himself. The sacraments are indeed means, but not the only, nor the most perfect means, to procure man's highest good; and not all who long for and partake of them are holy, or so disposed as that they may attain salvation; while, on the contrary, all who hunger and thirst after righteousness are blessed; since they have God's Spirit, who makes them alive more and more and leads them to this righteousness and to eternal life, of which he has given them the desire."

Of all human beings after Pascal the Jesuits most hated Doctor Arnauld, and it was a more lasting hatred, as Pascal's life was short. There was no weapon too foul or too poisonous to be used against such a foe; but all the barbs were dipped in the same virus—falsehood. They said he was a Calvinist and a Huguenot. They said he had been one of a deistical congress at Bourg-Fontaine, in 1621, for the abolition of Christianity: Arnauld was at that date nine years old. They accused him of assisting at a witches' sabbath, and affirmed that the devils present had stood in admiration of his speech; the Jesuits had a memorable association of the name Arnauld with diabolical speeches. They reported him to have commanded the Vaudois forces in Savoy; to have abjured the faith, and to have married a wife. They made him esquire, *armiger*, to the Presbyterian knight, Jurieu. And they ascribed to him a number of books which he never wrote. It was by his pen, indeed, that he was chiefly useful. We are told by Bayle that Arnauld was very simple in his manners, and that unless some question of importance was proposed to him, he seldom rose above the level of ordinary conversation; but that he no sooner undertook the formal discussion of any topic of science, than he was transformed into another man, pouring forth the most memorable sayings, and with the happy peculiarity that he was intelligible to the most common mind.

In the period of tranquillity which Port-Royal enjoyed after 1670, Arnauld was a frequent visiter, especially on all the Romish festivals. Here he met with Tillemont, de Sacy, Le Maître, and not seldom with those ardent friends of Port-Royal, the poets Racine and Boileau. One of them has left us a history of Port-Royal, the other an imperishable eulogy of Arnauld.\*

Arnauld's criticisms on the *Athalie*, are extant. Racine broke with Port-Royal, in his middle life, being wounded by Nicole's denunciation of his dramatic pursuits. When, in more sober years, he foreswore the stage, he repented of the severity with which in 1667 he had written against the instructors of his youth, and sought reconciliation. Boileau brought the repentant poet to the aged Arnauld, who had been lately reading the *Phèdre* with approval. Racine threw himself on his knees; but Arnauld did the same, embracing and kissing him, and promising unbroken friendship to the grave. It is related, that when Racine was reading to the king the last epistles of Boileau, now infirm with age, he laid an impressive and significant emphasis on the words,

"Arnauld, le grand Arnauld, fit mon apologie."

The works of Arnauld and Nicole against the Reformed, especially the great work entitled the *Perpetuity of the Faith* in its different forms, awakened great attention. In this controversy the famous Claude bore a conspicuous part. A copy of the work was in 1677 sent to Innocent XI., who commended it as one of the ablest defences of the faith. In the second of the four quarto volumes, Arnauld takes special pains to separate himself most distinctly from the Calvinists, by denying the imputation of Christ's righteousness and the perseverance of the

\* Mais des heureux regards de mon astre étonnant

Marquez bien cet effet encore plus surprenant,

Qui dans mon souvenir aura toujours sa place ;

Que de tant d' écrivains de l'école d' Ignace

Etant, comme je suis, ami si déclaré,

Ce docteur toutefois si craint, si révéral,

Qui contre eux de sa plume epuisa l' energie,

Arnauld, le grand Arnauld, fit mon apologie.

Sur son tombeau futur, mes Vers, pour l' enoncer,

Courez en lettres d'or de ce pas vous placer ;

Allez, jusqu' ou l' Aurore en naissant voit l' Hydaspes,

Chercher, pour l'y graver, le plus précieux jaspe :

Surtout à mes rivaux sachez bien l' etaler.—Ep. X., p. 223, ed. 1845.

saints. Jurieu wrote a most severe book against Arnauld, in which everything which could render the Doctor odious was gathered together: it was called *l'Esprit de M. Arnauld*. This spicy book brought enormous prices in France, partly because every thing of Jurieu's was proscribed, and partly because every thing against the Jansenists was in request.

This, so far as we know, was the last of Doctor Arnauld's polemical relations with the Reformed.

It is not generally known that Doctor Arnauld was much engaged in metaphysical inquiries. His earliest production in this field was a thesis on several points in physics and metaphysics, published in 1671. But his principal activity was in connexion with Cartesianism, of which some have made him an adherent: it is however shown by Mr. Simon,\* that the articles in which Arnauld agreed with Descartes were independently settled before he had read the works of the great philosophical reformer. After the appearance of the *Meditations*, several learned persons wrote against them; Hobbes and Gassendi were among the number, as was also Doctor Arnauld, then scarcely twenty-eight years of age.† He maintains that Augustine and other fathers anticipate Descartes in his argument for the being of God. He censures Descartes for affirming that God is positively *per se* as by a cause; and Descartes, in his reply, concedes the infelicity of his terms, and admits, 1. that God is not the cause of himself; and 2. that he does not sustain his own being by a positive influence. The objections of Arnauld are stated with singular gravity, modesty and politeness. It is well known that the relation of Descartes to the doctrine of transubstantiation led to great disputes. The Reformed theologians asserted that the Cartesian definition of matter was irreconcilable with this fundamental dogma of popery. Arnauld, as well as Descartes himself, attempted to prove the contrary.‡

This point was battled with Claude and Jurieu. During the little season of repose which preceded Arnauld's expatriation in 1679, he was much at Port-Royal, with de Sacy, Nicole, Lance-

\* Introduction to the Edition of Arnauld's Philosophical Works, Paris, 1843.

† The treatise of Arnauld may be seen in Professor Simon's edition of Descartes, Paris, 1844, p. 207, sqq.

‡ See Descartes' ingenious but perverso argument, in Génoude's *Raison du Christianisme*, volume I, p. 40, sqq.



lot, and the Duke de Luynes, who translated Descartes' Meditations. The conferences of these solitaries led to the production of the *Art de Penser*, once so famous, and still in the market. In this work Arnauld follows the very text of Descartes, in the chapter on Analysis and Synthesis, as he acknowledges. Except the defect, common to all books of that age, that it does not investigate the laws of experience and induction, it may still be regarded as a masterpiece; no logical treatise could have greater method, clearness, or concinnity.

The principal philosophical controversy of Arnauld, however, was waged with Malebranche, in regard to the *Traité de la Nature et de la Grace*, and the *Recherche de la Vérité*; this spread over the latter years of his life. Arnauld appeared in 1682 with his work on True and False Ideas, in which he examines Malebranche's hypothesis of seeing all things in God, and of the manner in which God's providence governs the world. In this controversy, involving the objective existence of ideas, Arnauld departs from the almost universal teaching of his day, and makes a startling approach to the doctrines of Reid.\* He characterizes Malebranche's system, as "the most ill-invented and unintelligible of hypotheses." In the judgment of Professor Jourdain, Arnauld, though right in his opinion, is inferior as a writer both to Descartes and Malebranche. Our space is insufficient to contain an account of the paper-war which ensued between the two metaphysicians. Malebranche made bitter complaints of the mode in which his adversary managed the war. He was himself a meditative visionary man: the Doctor of Sorbonne was a man of war from his cradle, accustomed to all the sleight and all the vehemence of the schools.

Among other philosophers with whom Doctor Arnauld was brought into connexion, Leibnitz was one. They frequently met in Paris, and had conferences respecting a compromise between the Roman Catholics and the Protestants; which was a favourite scheme of Leibnitz. (On this point see an interesting

\*Strange to say, Dr. Reid classes Arnauld with those who held that we do not perceive external things immediately. The doctrine of Arnauld on this head was precisely that which was afterwards maintained by Reid himself. If there had not been so general an ignorance in Great Britain of the French metaphysics, Doctor Reid might have been as much embarrassed in regard to this statement, as in regard to Buffier; whose work was translated to annoy him.

article in *La Reformation*, of Geneva, vol. iii. No. 48, year 1847). The German philosopher continued as long as he lived to correspond with Arnauld, and says of him, that he knew no man better fitted than the Doctor, to penetrate into the depth of things. "If we reflect," says M. Jourdain, in his elegant essay on Arnauld, "that philosophy was not his habitual study, that the treatises which he gave to it form but an inconsiderable part of his volumes, and that he wrote his numberless works, not in the silence of a peaceable retreat, with the calm so necessary to meditation, but amidst the inquietudes of persecution and exile, far from his family and friends, and sometimes not knowing at night where he should rest the next day, we shall no longer wonder that his contemporaries, admiring the inexhaustible resources of his genius and his courage, named him 'the great Arnauld.'"

After the peaceful period to which we have more than once alluded, the persecutions of Archbishop Harlay forced Doctor Arnauld to abandon France. It has been said that he spent forty-five years of his life, either lying perdu in France, or in exile. He was in almost perpetual incognito, at Mons, Ghent, Brussels, Antwerp, and other places, chiefly in Belgium. His enemies treated his flight as a confession of political intrigues, against which he pleaded the uniform loyalty of the Arnaulds. In 1690, he was at Brussels, but so endangered that he did not leave the house. When, during his wanderings, Nicole advised him at length to indulge himself in rest, Arnauld exclaimed with warmth, "Rest! rest! Have we not a whole eternity for rest!" In Leyden he became acquainted with the famous Elzevirs. At the Hague, he wrote a violent tract against William of Orange, entitled "*Le Prince d'Orange, nouvel Absalon, nouvel Hérode, nouveau Cromwell.*" Voltaire pronounces positively from internal evidence that this tract is not Arnauld's; the contrary is nevertheless now fully established. When the war broke out anew between Spain and France, the exiled octogenarian was forced to leave the Spanish Netherlands; he went to Holland, where he was dogged by Jesuit spies, under the guise of begging friars. That he should have composed so many works, on the most important subjects, in such circumstances, is almost incredible. The words used concerning Jerome have been well applied to Arnauld: *Quis nostrum tan-*

*ta potest legere, quanta ille conscripsit?* The editor of his complete work enumerates three hundred and twenty; they fill forty-five quarto volumes.

After the year 1665, the pious Quesnel was the faithful companion of his exile. Arnauld's last work was his "Reflections on the eloquence of the Pulpit." In the judgment of Boileau, French Literature contains nothing better on this subject. "It is astonishing that a man in extreme old age should have retained this full force of mind and memory." When his nephew Pomponne was called to the ministry, there were hopes held out that Arnauld would return to France. But he would not assent to the terms, namely, that he should not write against the Jesuits. For though he had no expectation of ever doing so again, he would not yield his liberty, unless the same silence were promised by the adversary. He passed the last four years of his life in great seclusion, and in those habits of ceremonial religion which, among the papists, are esteemed indicative of inward piety. When now more than eighty, he still rose at five, and, having prayed on his knees, said matins and lauds. He observed the canonical hours, with the Paris Breviary, as far as strength allowed. He read mass with much solemnity, showing that, Augustinian as he was, he was yet no Protestant. After meals followed recreation, and especially chat with friends. At nine he said the regular prayers, and united with the family and servants in a devotion in which mention was made of Port-Royal. During the last few months of his life, he learned the whole Psalter by heart; saying that it was a provision against the loss of his sight. He died, by easy and gradual decay, on the eighth day of August, 1694. One of his biographers says: "The gentleness of this transition to divine rest left on his countenance an expression so soft and lovely, that no one could behold it without wonder. It was a remnant of the mark which the mildness of his mind and heart during life had left on his features. For whatever the enemies of Arnauld may say, meekness was his characteristic traits. Moses, who had embued his hands in the blood of an Egyptian, when brethren were to be defended; who in holy indignation had broken the tables of the law; who had turned the edge of his sword against twenty-three thousand men, to punish the idolatry of his people; and who had manifested his zeal by

other fearful proofs, was nevertheless named by the Spirit of God the meekest of men." The heart of Arnould was enclosed in a heart of silver, at the request of Madame Vaes, the wife of his hospitable friend, and was carried to Port-Royal. On this event Santeuil composed verses of which he sorely repented.\*

We have now given an account of the Arnaulds for three generations, the last of these being the ten children of the parliamentary advocate. In our rapid sketch of the fourth generation, we are concerned with but two households, namely the children of d'Andilly, and the children of Le Maistre.

ANTONY ARNAULD, known as the Abbé, was born in 1616, was a soldier in 1643, then became a priest, and died in 1699. He is noted as having contributed to the family annals.

CATHARINE DE STE. AGNES was a nun in Port-Royal, and died in 1643.

SIMON, Marquis of POMPONNE, born in 1618, was one of the prominent men of his day. He was ambassador to Sweden, twice a cabinet minister of Louis XIV., and perpetually mentioned in the fascinating gossip of Madame de Sévigné.

CHARLES HENRY DE LUSANCI, born in 1623, became in 1641 a solitary of Port-Royal, and died in 1684.

ANGELIQUE DE ST. JEAN, the second Angelique, born in 1624, was a nun of Port-Royal, and abbess of the same, from 1678 to 1684. She was a person of distinguished genius, and by some preferred to all the rest in this respect. She was almost born a nun, having been reared for the very purpose. Her taste for composition and the fine arts was such as to require restraint. It is odd to read the titles of her published works, which show how prominent females may become, under the flexible system of popery.†

MARIE CHARLOTTE DE STE. CLAIRE, MARIE ANGELIQUE DE STE. THERESE, and ANNE MARIE, the three youngest daugh-

\* Ad sanctas rediit sedes ejectus et exul:  
 Hoste triumphato, tot tempestatibus actus,  
 Hoc portu in placido, hac sacra tellure quiescit  
 Arnaldus, veri defensor, et arbiter aequæ.  
 Illius ossa memor sibi vindicet extera tellus;  
 Huc coelestis amor rapidis cor transtulit alis,  
 Cor nunquam avulsum, nec amatis sedibus absens.

† For example, "Discours de la reverende mère Marie Angelique de St. Jean, abbesse de P. R. des Champs," etc. Paris, 1726.



ters of d'Andilly were all nuns of Port-Royal: of these the youngest died in 1700.

The only remaining family is that of Isaac Le Maistre, who intermarried with Catharine, the second child of the advocate Antony. Of this marriage, there were four children, whom we cannot entirely omit, for reasons which will appear. ANTONY LE MAISTRE was born in 1608, and was brought up in the house of his uncle d'Andilly. His genius and ardour early led his friends to compare him with his eloquent grandfather the conqueror of the Jesuits. As soon as he was of age, he burst upon the public as an accomplished forensic orator. Preachers left their churches to hear Le Maistre at the bar; just as it is said that advocates now-a-days forsake the halls of justice when Lacordaire preaches. After entering on a most brilliant career, he threw himself into solitude at Port-Royal, where as he was one of the first, so he was one of the most useful of the recluses, especially by his well known translation of the scriptures. Though he allowed himself free study of Hebrew and Greek, he maintained so rigid a separation from the world, that he attended neither his father's funeral, nor the subsequent entrance of his mother as a novice; such are the unnatural results of monasticism, even in the most sincere.

JEAN DE ST. ELME, Le Maistre's second son, was the father of two daughters, who died in Port-Royal. SIMON SERICOURT, died as a recluse, in Port-Royal, October 4, 1650.

ISAAC DE SACY, the youngest child, born 1613, is always mentioned in connection with Antony Le Maistre. Their works are well known even among Protestants. The translation of the Bible was begun 1655, to supersede the popular Reformed version; not to say, that the Jansenists were bold in defence of bible-reading in the vernacular. When Le Maistre died, he left the work to be completed by his brother. Agreeably to that community of labour, which was peculiar to Port-Royal, the New Testament was the joint work of the brothers, together with Fontaine, Arnould, Nicole, Pontchateau, St. Marthe, de la Laine, and the count Troisville. De Sacy and Fontaine were special objects of persecution, and were even thrown into the Bastille. This version of the New Testament was printed at Amsterdam, by the Elzevirs, in 1667, in two volumes 8vo.

It led, while yet in manuscript, to the antagonist version of Father Amelotte, in 1666, 1667.

Here we close our notices of a remarkable family. But we cannot do so without acknowledging our obligation to the work of Dr. Reuchlin, mentioned in the margin. During his skilful and patient labours this learned writer had peculiar advantages for research, so that his delightful volumes may be regarded as the first complete history of Port-Royal. He spent many months in Paris, and enjoyed free access to the unparalleled collections of that city. He speaks with enthusiasm of the sacrifices which the Parisian librarians make for the convenience of authors. "When men, whose hours are precious to science, often spend more time in searching for a fugitive sheet, than the seeker does in perusing it, one is almost tempted to forego so costly a privilege." Many of the manuscripts which Dr. Reuchlin consulted, had never been unfolded before. From some of the autograph orders of Louis XIV. for the destruction of Port-Royal, the fine sawdust, used to dry the ink, fell off under the hands of our author. In Switzerland, especially in Geneva, and in Germany, he picked up some treasures. He even went as far as Rome. Though the doors of the Vatican were not quite so open as we hope soon to see them, Dr. Reuchlin was invited by some high ecclesiastics to enter. Ranke speaks of similar courtesies. After certain delays he was even admitted to consult the manuscripts. The objection to this, in ordinary cases, is that as they are generally bound up in volumes, an inquisitive antiquary might sometimes find the most sacred or portentous documents side by side with the object of his search; this was verified in Dr. Reuchlin's experience, in a particular case. We will add that he is the author of a life of Pascal, and of a work on Christianity.\*

\* Das Christenthum in Frankreich innerhalb u. ausserhalb der Kirche. Hamburg, 1837. 464. His great work is however the one just alluded to: "*Geschichte jesuitischen Katholicismus unter Louis XIII. and XIV. Von Dr. Hermann Reuchlin.*" Hamburg und Gotha." 8vo. 2 vols. Five years elapsed between the publication of the two volumes, the second appearing in 1844. The first volume gave occasion to a celebrated article in the *Edinburgh Review* for 1841, which however contains some surprising inaccuracies. We have had before us, in addition, the following works: *Bayle*, "*Dictionnaire Historique et Critique*," Amst. 1740.—*Racine*, "*Abrégé de l'Histoire de Port-Royal*," Paris, 1835.—*Cornelii Jansenii*, "*Augustinus*, etc." fol. 1743. This copy contains the treatise of Conroy on Unbaptized Infants, which was missing in Reuchlin's.

- ART. II.—2. *Canticum Canticorum Solomonis Homilice XXXI*, a Theod. Beza. Geneva.
2. *Song of Solomon, newly translated from the original Hebrew, with a Commentary and Annotations*; by Bishop Percy. London. 1764.
3. *Clavis Cantici, or an Exposition of the Song of Solomon*, by the Rev. James Durham; with an address to the Christian reader, by John Owen.
4. *An Exposition of the Book of Solomon's Song*, by John Gill, D.D.
5. *The Song of Songs, a New Translation with a commentary and Notes*, by T. Williams.
6. *Critical History and Defence of the Old Testament Canon*, by Moses Stuart.

The last of these volumes has been placed in this connexion, that we may notice the strictures it contains on the Song of Solomon. Into a consideration of the general merits of this work of Prof. Stuart on the Old Testament, we have no disposition now to enter. In a chapter on "Conscientious Scruples as to a part of the Old Testament,"—he treats the Song in a way that must grieve many a pious heart. Years ago, when faithful and far-sighted men were lifting a warning voice against incipient but dangerous error, we did trust, in the exercise of the charity which "hopeth all things," that their fears might be ill founded, and that one who had been such a luminary in the sphere of biblical learning, would be enabled to withstand the disturbing influences and pass on without material perturbations. If we are not in error, the first step is here taken towards breaking in on the canon of the scriptures. The mind that begins with explaining away some of the old-fashioned doctrines, may not be satisfied to stop until it has set aside some of the old fashioned books of the word of God. Professing to receive the Song as a part of the canon, and on this account manifesting a kind of friendship for its contents, Mr. Stuart treats this book in a way

*Nicole*, "Oeuvres, etc." Paris 1727, six vol.—*Bussy-Rabutin*, "Mémoires et Lettres," 7 vols. 12mo. Amst. 1721. *Arnauld*, "Logique de Port-Royal; ed. C. Jourdain," Paris, 1846; and "Oeuvres Philosophiques," ed. Simon. Paris, 1843. —*Des Cartes*, "Oeuvres," Paris, 1844.—*Malebranche*, "Oeuvres," Paris, 1846. —*De Seigne*, "Lettres," Paris, 1844.—*De Genoude*, "La Raison du Christianisme," 4to. Paris, 1836.

that shows obviously strong prejudices against it and an unwillingness to receive it as a part of Scripture, were not the testimony in its favour so overwhelming. It is a mystery how a man can receive a book as inspired, and yet apply to it such language as he uses concerning this song.

"Certain it is," says he, "that the Canticles were a part of the canon sanctioned by Christ and the Apostles. Nothing as a matter of fact in ancient criticism, is more certain. It is of no use to deny this, or to make efforts to evade it. . . . I have often heard it said by the friends of Pres. Edwards, that he was particularly fond of the book of Canticles, and read and meditated much upon it. His character for piety was such as entirely forbids the supposition that he was secretly nourishing his animal passions by this. . . . As a book of amatory odes we might praise and admire it; for in the original, it is much more delicate than our English version represents it to be. But we shrink instinctively from connecting amatory ideas and feelings with a devotional frame of mind. . . . The perusal of the original makes much less impression on me of an exceptionable kind, than the perusal of our version. That there are many passages in this pastoral, if any must needs so call it, which are highly beautiful and tender and delicate, is quite certain. A heathen poet who had sung carnal love in like manner, would have doubtless been immortal among the Cyrethereans." His conclusion is, "that the Canticles is a book rather to be regarded in the light of a local one, and adapted to partial usage, than as a book now under the full light of the gospel, especially adapted to our use. It had its day." He says that the books containing the detail of the Levitical rites and ceremonies, have ceased to have any other interest for us than that they aid in the authentication of the Bible, prevent it from assuming a mythic appearance, and lead to the persuasion that what it describes is reality and not romance; that all the books of the Old Testament which prescribe and regulate these things have become in a good measure obsolete. "For us men of occidental tastes and habits and of only ordinary growth in piety, . . . who have a task difficult enough to keep our passions in due subjection even when we shun all the temptation and excitement that we can, it is the safer and better course to place the Canticles among the books withdrawn from ordinary use.



Canticles as a means of devotion, is superseded for us by better means. This is reason enough, independently of the danger of being excited in an undue way, to prefer other parts of the scripture.\* In the words of Witsius on a similar occasion, *At quid est sacratissima quaeque in profana, absurda, et ridicula ver tere, si hoc non est?*† These words of Mr. Stuart carry with them their own refutation. We should be sorry to be under the responsibility of having put forth charges, that every man who studies the Song of Solomon with less reputation for piety than Pres. Edwards, may be suspected of “secretly nourishing his animal passions by this;” and that the Holy Spirit has put into the hands of fallen man, a book which cannot be read without exposing ourselves to dangerous “temptation and excitement.” In the infidel commentators of Germany, such expressions do not strike us with surprise. In one for whose piety we have always had profound respect, they fill us with real grief. His argument rests on two assumptions, neither of which is tenable. The first is, that this book belongs to the same class with those which describe the Levitical rites and ceremonies: the second is that “all that part of the Old Testament which prescribes and regulates these things, is no longer a matter of practical moment to us, but only a portion of the history of God’s former dealings with his church.” Canticles formed no part of the Jewish law, nor was it in any way connected with their ceremonial services. Their ritual had been completed, and their civil polity established, nearly five hundred years before this book was written. The Jews never numbered it among the books constituting what they called the law. As though aware of the weakness of this

\* M’Cheyne remarks in his sermon on Cant. ii. 8–13, that no book of the scriptures furnishes a better text than does the song, of the depth of a man’s christianity. If his religion be *in his head only*, a dry form of doctrines,—he will see nothing here to attract him; if it have a place *merely in his fancy*, he will fail to be attracted by this book; but if his religion have a *hold on his heart* by the love of Christ shed abroad through the spirit, this will be a favorite portion of the word of God. Such is the testimony of one who has exhibited “as beauteous a character and as effective a ministry as He who holds the seven stars has exhibited to the church in these last days.” Says his friend Mr. Hamilton, “his adoring contemplations naturally gathered round them the imagery, and language of the Song of Solomon. Indeed, he had preached so often on that beautiful book, that at last he had scarcely left himself a single text of its ‘good matter’ which had not been discoursed on already.”

† De Prophetis in Caanan, 39.

position, Mr. Stuart seems to make an effort for giving it strength, by examining conscientious scruples as to Esther and Ecclesiastes, and enrolling them among the obsolete portions of scripture. The impression can hardly be avoided, that the two last mentioned books have been thus specially noticed in his work on the Canon, in order to prepare the way for a more successful stroke at the Song.

But even could it be fully shown that this book belongs to the ritual portions of the Old Testament; we deny that the Pentateuch, its ceremonies, and all the architectural details of the tabernacle, and the temple have merely the value of ancient history,—of materials for enabling the curious to trace the progress of invention in manufactures, luxuries and conveniences of life,—the architect to gratify the desire to know the history of his art. There is a disposition abroad to undervalue the Old Testament. Its teachings stand very much in the way of those sentiments on imputation and atonement, which are drawn less from the word of God than from metaphysical reasoning. The books of scripture are all essential parts of one great fabric. Each has a peculiar place and value. The observance of the ceremonies of the law has been abolished, but the truths taught by those ceremonies, lie at the foundation of the system of salvation, and cannot be properly understood without the illustrations those comparisons supply. When those rites were appointed, "there was not an object in the material world which would convey to the mind the idea of God's holiness: the idea, therefore, would have to be originated, and thrown into their mind, through the senses, by a process instituted for that express purpose. The plan to originate the idea, in order to meet the constitution of the mind, must consist of a series of comparisons. The idea of God's moral purity conveyed by the Mosaic economy, has descended from the Hebrew, through the Greek, to our own language, and there is, so far as known, no other word in the world which conveys to the mind the true idea of God's moral purity, but that originated by the institution which God prescribed to Moses upon the Mount."\* The same is true of other doctrines. How can we arrive at a correct understanding of these truths, without studying them in the instructions given

\* Philosophy of the plan of salvation, p. 75, 79. We subjoin the following be-

by God? In the epistle to the Hebrews, the Apostle explains the Jewish rites, showing that although the observance of them is no longer binding, a knowledge of them must be ever necessary to man for comprehending the way of atonement and sanctification. These services are the alphabet of our religious knowledge. We cannot speak of the way of salvation without using language drawn from this source. And that man will have the clearest, most evangelical and most comforting view of the scheme of redemption, who is willing to neglect the airy nothings floating in the regions of metaphysical speculation, and give his attention to a deep exploration of the imperishable foundation which has been laid in these ritual services, for his consolation and hope. Have the parables of the New Testament been rendered obsolete by the full didactic statements of doctrine in the epistles? Our Lord found it necessary to begin his instructions by comparisons, and he illustrated a different class of truths from those already elucidated under the law. With reverence would we suggest, that less is lost by inattention to the parables of the gospels, than by neglect of the services of the Jewish ritual. The key to the interpretation of them, has been furnished by our Lord, through his inspired Apostle. These objections to the Song do therefore amount to nothing. That the author of our faith should have given such a book as this by inspiration, is reasonable, and is what might be expected.

The effect of sin has been to destroy in the human heart the love of God, and substitute for it the love of unworthy things. The object of redemption is the restoration of man from his condition of enmity against God, and from all the consequences of sin, to the possession and enjoyment of perfect love to God. Hence, as hatred of God is the spirit of sin, love is represented as the essential grace, as the fulfilling of the law. The growth of the soul in holiness, must be estimated not by deep excite-

cause these writers will not be suspected of being trammelled by old modes of thinking. "Judaism was a propædæutic to Christianity; but there was no formal definition of any one spiritual truth in the whole of that economy. The purpose of it was to school the mind to spiritual contemplation; to awaken the religious consciousness by types and symbols, and other perceptive means, to the realization of certain great spiritual ideas; and to furnish words and analogies in which the truths of Christianity could be embodied and proclaimed to the world." Morell's *Phil. of Religion*, p. 140. "The Jewish ritual was an obscure text, which awaited the divine commentary of the Christian dispensation." Harris's *Pre-Adamite earth*, p. 273.

ment whether of ecstasy or of overwhelming sorrow, not by burning zeal or untiring activity, not by acquaintance with all mysteries and knowledge, not by giving our goods to feed the poor and our body to be burned; but by the love which beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things. Perfect sanctification carries with it perfect love. The death of Christ, the agency of the Holy Spirit, all the means of grace, all the dealings of providence with the saints, converge on this one point, the forming anew in man, of this lost love. As the sanctification of the soul is through the truth, we might therefore suppose, that in giving us the scriptures, God would give full elucidations of this very important principle or affection. This he has been careful to do. He has shown love to be not only important but essential, 1 Cor. xiii. 1-3; he has given a full and excellent definition of it as the root of our best and holy feelings, 1 Cor. xiii. 4-7, and has shown its perpetuity, its superiority to knowledge, faith, and hope, and its inseparable connection with the happiness and existence of the soul of man, 1 Cor. xiii. 8-13. He has embodied it for our benefit in the living example of Jesus Christ, has shown that God to whose image we must be restored, is love, 1 John iv. 8, and has given the blood of his Son for removing the difficulty in the way of establishing in us this principle, and has sent his Spirit for forming it within us by a new creation, and for opening channels in the heart, through which its influence may reach and control all our other powers. All this has been necessary, because divine love is so perfectly opposite to our natural disposition. Its presence makes us new creatures, gives us new workings of the affections, and prompts to new language from the lips.

Now it is not unreasonable to suppose, that he who has given us such means for cherishing this heavenly affection, would go farther and add a description of the actual operations of a heart in which this love is found, and would give us language such as these emotions would naturally adopt in using the words of men; so that in giving utterance to his love, the saints should not be left to the uncertainty and danger of adopting such words as human error might suggest, but have ready furnished language of precision and beauty made ready to our hands by the same Spirit who is working within us this affection. Much of the difficulty and uncertainty of metaphysical disquisitions,



arises from the imperfection of language and the want of precision in its use. Words are the signs of ideas; and if the language in which we hear or speak on any subject, must be incorrect, it is important that those who have received a spiritual discernment of the things which are freely given to us of God, should be able to speak of them, not in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but in words which the Holy Ghost teacheth, 1 Cor. ii. 13, that the Spirit who prompts the emotion, should furnish the language in which such emotion may find suitable utterance for showing forth the praise of the Redeemer. This has been done for us in a beautiful manner in the Song of Solomon.

The services of the Jewish ritual point out the way in which this newness of heart, this divine love may be attained by sinners. The epistle to the Hebrews, as well as the general language of piety, shows how impossible it is to understand the worth of Christ and the office of the Holy Spirit, without those typical allusions. The leprosy is the emblem of our spiritual state by nature; the sacrifices show the ground of pardon; the sacred anointing oil and the water of the laver illustrate the excellency of the Holy Spirit, and his cleansing power in developing those fruits, the first of which is love. In the same mode by allegorical language and emblems, the Song shows what this affection is as already formed and in operation. The heart on which the work of the Spirit has been felt to the greatest extent can best tell how much at a loss we must be in speaking of spiritual exercises and love to Jesus, were we cut off from the language of this song. Should the soul be influenced to these feelings by the Holy Spirit, and inclined to use such expressions of devoted love, without having at the same time a knowledge of this book as given by inspiration,—we would hesitate, would feel ourselves guilty of presumption, and would not answer those who might presume to upbraid us with irreverence or fanaticism. There are persons of undoubted piety, in the early stages of the Christian life, though having long borne the profession, who are as reluctant to believe the reality of the exercises of the most advanced Christians, as is the impenitent to admit the reality of the first emotions attending a change of heart: the error in both instances arises from unwillingness to believe what has not been personally experienced. If in consequence of never having

felt such deep emotions, persons of certain attainments in piety may object to this book as using language too strong; the unrenewed heart may, with the same propriety, doubt the reality of all the exercises of religion. Beyond controversy, there are spiritual exercises which can be better and more naturally expressed in the language of this song, than in any other portion of the scriptures. And the Holy Spirit has put into our hands this precious scroll written full of the characters of love, and whispers to us that we can never do wrong in speaking of Jesus in these terms, and that we may judge of the nature of our love to him by our disposition to speak of him in such language, and by finding in our hearts emotions corresponding with these expressions.

The several books of the word of God have some particular aim and some leading topic. The gospels furnish the life of God manifest in flesh; the epistle to the Hebrews opens the doctrine of atonement as vicarious and possessing infinite value from the divine nature of Him who suffered; Proverbs embody the practical duties of daily life; the Psalms are the pious heart's language of devotion, the song is its language of love. Devotion being the utterance of the different feelings of the soul in combination, and resting with reverence on the majesty and goodness of God, and love being the bond which brings us into union with God, and gives all our other powers their proper exercise: we find in the Psalms expressions in which to embody our general feelings of repentance, contrition, trust, veneration, and praise: in the Song, the expressions are restricted to the various operations of the one exercise of love. The deepest spiritual emotions of the human soul are here exhibited in a way best adapted to the comprehension and wants of man. In the portraits of Shakspeare, we have veins of a profound metaphysics never surpassed, yet so arrayed in flesh and blood, that we overlook the mental abstractions, in the beauty and attractiveness of their guise. And no metaphysical disquisition however labored no didactic statement, however clear, could give so intelligibly as does this Song, the nature of those exalted exercises of the human soul, which constitute love to our redeeming Lord.

Love to Jesus Christ becomes, through sanctification, the strongest passion that can take possession of the human heart.

Ambition, avarice, and passion may have more of the unnatural vigour attending fever; this carries with it the quiet, enduring energy of health, with sufficient power to consume those unhallowed principles and bring into captivity every thought to the obedience of Jesus. The power of this love cannot be known without being felt; and none but those who have experienced the greatest intensity of it possible on earth, can be capable judges whether language used in expressing it, may be exaggerated. The love of the pious heart to God being thus strong and indeed not utterable even by the strongest terms; the love of God towards us is as incomprehensible as his eternity, omnipresence, or almighty power. If therefore He condescends to illustrate to our comprehension the nature of this reciprocal love, the Holy Spirit must be expected to draw his comparisons from the strongest and tenderest instances of affection known among men, and use, in so doing, all the coloring that can be supplied even from the domains of poetry. Hence in this Song the relation of husband and bride is selected. Nor is this comparison peculiar to the Song. It is read throughout the New no less than the Old Testament; and at the close of revelation the church is spoken of as the bride, the wife of the Lamb. The relation of father and son, imperfect though it be, is nevertheless the best that language can furnish for setting forth the union between the first and second persons of the Trinity; and the relation between husband and wife is the best known to us for illustrating the union between Jesus and his redeemed. This union must be far more intimate, and far more tender, than the marriage relation. The attachment of two persons, strangers to each other previously, during almost their whole life, must, even in its greatest purity, ripeness and strength, fall very far below the love of Jesus for a soul he has formed for the end of loving him; whose constitution has been framed by sanctification of the Holy Ghost, according to what he can love and desires to love; whom he has allured to himself by overpowering manifestations of love; whom he loved not merely from the first moments of its being, but even before the origin of its being, and who owes its being to his loving it before it was called into existence, even before the world began; over whose course he has watched from its first breath; for

whose rescue from misery He did himself submit to death. Besides all this, He has the tender and incomprehensible love of the infinite God. **Such** love on his part, demands corresponding affection on ours. And how can any earthly comparison reach the measure of **this** love, when it is such that if any man hate not his father and mother, and wife and children, and brethren and sisters, **yea**, and his own life also, he cannot be worthy of the love of his Lord. The comparison of father and son is not more imperfect in expressing the relation of the first and second persons of **the** Trinity, than is the love of husband and wife, even when taken in the strongest terms, imperfect in unfolding the love of Christ for his people. This illustration of that love is the best we can now have; but like all human comparisons applied to God, falls very far short of the truth. The expressions in **the** song, however hyperbolical they may seem to some minds, give therefore nothing more than a shadow of this love. The language appears strong, not because it is exaggerated, but because we are not capable of appreciating the love of God. Now, we see the love of Christ, through a glass darkly, even in our brightest hours. Angels who have a better understanding of the subject, see that this language, instead of being exaggerated, is, as everything heavenly expressed in human language, must be, very imperfect. Though the Holy Spirit has selected the most endearing relation on earth, the marriage state, and set forth the reciprocal affections of that relation in the glowing terms, ardent language, and richly colored imagery of oriental poetry, the whole is not sufficient for enabling us to comprehend in any other than an indistinct manner, the wondrous love of Christ which passeth knowledge.

Beset with the inseparable infirmity of human nature, an over estimate of ourselves, and forgetting that the difficulty in understanding it, may be mainly with us, we act as though capable judges of the extent of God's love, and of the way it should be expressed; and we censure the language of the Holy Spirit as improper and extravagant, because we know so little of this love as to be unable to see how incomprehensible is its nature. All the objections brought against the Song arise from this source. Those who would reject it from the canon of scripture, or if retaining it, would pass it over in silence as unfit



for use in the present age, do this, not because it has less direct testimony than the other books in favour of its inspiration, but because its general character is not what they would expect to find in writing coming from God. No part of the scriptures can show more uninterruptedly than this, the concurrent testimony of the Jewish and Christian churches. It bears the clearest internal evidence of having been written by the author of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes. The affection here illustrated is a leading one in the Christian life; the mode of illustrating it, is the one generally employed in other parts of the word of God, and is indeed the best that could be used for the purpose. All this certain opposers of the book will admit; but still object to it strenuously through prejudices arising from what appears to them exaggerated, if not indelicate expressions. Under these circumstances, and in view of what has been already said concerning the impossibility of doing anything like full justice to the infinite love of God in human language even adorned with the highest efforts of poetic genius; such persons would do well to reflect that the difficulty lies not in the book, but in themselves; that the Holy Spirit can use no other than the best possible words, and that all these apparent imperfections might vanish under the influence of a keener spiritual discernment and a deeper love. Different minds in which sin exerts an influence, have an affinity for different kinds of error, and opposition to different kinds of truth. As sanctification releases us from our native corruptions, by degrees, the Christian life is a gradual progress in working the soul loose from the dominion of error. Hence some men reject the whole word of God; others reject particular books; while some persons who receive as inspired the whole canon of scripture, can never become reconciled to some of its doctrines. A defect in the intellectual or spiritual man, is the root of all this error. The defect is not in the pages of inspiration, but in the human heart. "The cartoons of Raphael at Hampton Court Palace," says Dr. Arnold,\* "the frescoes of the same great painter in the galleries of the Vatican at Rome, the famous statues of the Laocoon and the Apollo Belvedere, and the church of St. Peter at Rome, the

\* *Miscellaneous Works*, p. 370.

most magnificent building perhaps in the world,—all alike are generally found to disappoint a person on his first view of them. But let him be sure that they are excellent and that he only wants the knowledge and the taste to appreciate them properly, and every succeeding sight of them will open his eyes more and more, till he learns to admire them, not indeed as much as they deserve, but so much as greatly to enrich and enlarge his own mind, by becoming acquainted with such perfect beauty. So it is with great poets: they must be read often and studied reverently, before an unpractised mind can gain anything like an adequate notion of their excellence. The reader must be convinced that if he does not fully admire them, it is his fault and not theirs. Here, as in everything else, humility is the surest path to exaltation.” These remarks apply with the greatest force to the scriptures, embodying, as they do, in the noblest and most appropriate language, not the conceptions of the human intellect, but truths so unusual, so grand, and so ennobling, that even after having been revealed, they cannot be received by the natural man without a discernment imparted by the Spirit. The truths illustrated in this song are preëminently among those which are spiritually discerned. They are not so much the principles of the doctrine of Christ, as the things which are brought more particularly into view as we go on unto perfection. The nature of the subject, love, makes it belong to the advanced part of the Christian life more especially; and as sanctification refines our spiritual perceptions, and by raising us from our degradation of darkness, towards the condition of saints in light, gives us the ability to appreciate the love of Jesus,—we see more and more beauty in this song,—we see in it nothing but beauty, we find our objections against it arose from the corrupt heart rather than from the book, we feel thankful that the Author of our faith has provided for us words so rich, so glowing, and so perfect, for giving utterance to our emotions;—and we rejoice to find, under the light of the Holy Ghost, our unsanctified misapprehensions giving place to the conviction that the love of Jesus towards us is infinitely greater than is even here expressed.

The scriptures contain truths, promises, and illustrations adapted to every variety of circumstances and to every grade

of religious experience. Particular truths can be fully understood, and the power of certain promises can be adequately felt, only by our being brought into situations where the soul is made to feel the need of those very truths and those very promises. Here are innumerable gradations of truths adapted to the different degrees of the growth of the soul in grace, from the first exercises of conviction, to the highest measure of sanctification attainable on earth. A particular development of our spiritual perceptions is requisite for feeling the beauty and power of any one of the portions of truth in this ascending scale; and as the unrenewed man, even with profound learning, fails to apprehend the perfection of beauty in passages with which he has a mere scientific acquaintance; the Christian, while understanding all the heart can know of the truths adapted to the steps of religious experience through which he has passed, may yet fail to comprehend and appreciate thoroughly, portions of holy writ lying in regions of pious exercises whereunto he has not attained. Three things are necessary for understanding perfectly the scriptures: such an acquaintance with them as may be derived from human learning; the illumination of the Holy Spirit; and a position in the circumstances for which those truths were specially given and adapted. The two last are not inferior in importance to the first. And other things being equal, the man who has the advantage not only of the teaching of the Spirit, but of being led by Providence through the circumstances of life in which the want of certain promises is felt and their comforting power enjoyed, will be better able than other persons to see beauty, and richness, and glory in many domains of gospel truth, which must have lain unobserved by him, had he not been drawn into these green pastures and beside these still waters by the Presence that dwelt amid the pillar of fire in the wilderness.

Hence, this song is not so much a favorite in the early stage of the religious life, as at subsequent periods when we have grown in grace. It is the manual of the advanced Christian. When love has been more perfected by the Spirit, hither do we come for expressions of that love. When we are anxious to hear from the lips of Jesus the fulness of his love to us, here do we rejoice to sit and listen. The Jews were not wrong when they represented this book as the holy of holies in the fabric of

revelation; for assuredly, the voice here speaking, the living oracles here uttered, can be heard only by those who have been initiated into the mysteries of godliness, and dwell under the shadow of the Almighty. Accordingly, this book has been a favourite with eminent Christians. While some persons versed in biblical lore, but ignorant of the alphabet of piety, can see nothing further in this song than an amatory eclogue; and others whose piety we are far from doubting, can represent these words given by inspiration, as "leading us away from pure and spiritual devotion," by "connecting amatory ideas and feelings with a devotional frame of mind;" there is, and always has been in the church, a class of persons of no questionable character for ability, learning, or holiness, who esteem this book among the choicest portions of the word of God. There must be excellence in that which occupied so deeply the affections of such persons as Leighton, Lady Guyon, President Edwards, Rutherford and McCheyne.

When, therefore, this song is admitted to be inspired, and to have been sanctioned and loved by the ablest and most saintly men of even the present age; those who make these concessions, and yet hold the book in disesteem, would act with humility and wisdom by feeling that the difficulty in appreciating it lies with themselves. Much of what is censured as exceptionable, is found in our translation rather than in the original. If this book be rejected on account of objectionable passages, other parts of the scriptures must be set aside on the same grounds. What are called by some persons the indelicate passages of holy writ are far from being found in this song. We venture to assert that the parts looked on with most distrust are capable of a natural interpretation incapable of offending the most sensitive modesty, and tending directly to our edification in holiness. With the same reasonable spirit which is essential for enjoying the finest works of uninspired genius, let us feel that this song is everything it has been represented by an innumerable crowd of witnesses; that we are not at liberty to reject or neglect a book so manifestly of divine origin; that if the Song has been ridiculed by the corrupt heart or misused to purposes of evil, the same has happened with almost every other portion of the Bible: that all scripture is given by inspiration of God,



and is profitable; and that by patient continuance as learners at the feet of Him who is meek and lowly of heart, we too shall become sensible of its beauties and filled with admiring love.

The first words are as certainly given by inspiration as any succeeding portion of this book, and show the estimation in which the Song is held by the Holy Spirit. It is called the Song of Songs, or the most excellent song. For the purpose of meeting the numerous objections brought against this portion of scripture, the divine wisdom writes on the very front of it, an attestation of its superior excellence not only to the thousand and five songs of Solomon, but to all the songs ever produced by all other poets. He who cannot err, tells us, in language of no doubtful meaning, that this song is unrivalled.

Poetry is the expression of the best and most beautiful thoughts, of exalted emotions, in the best and the most beautiful language. The language of poetry is the language of excited feeling. The best poetry must have the noblest theme, deal with the purest emotions, and be adorned with the richest ideas. God has garnished his works of every kind with beauty, and formed us with a capability of receiving pleasure from that beauty. Hence in conveying to us important truth, He does, throughout the scriptures, make it attractive by adapting it to this love within us of the beautiful. Now, love is the very excellence of God, for "God is love." Love is the purest, deepest, and most powerful emotion known to man. Nothing can therefore be better or more beautiful than the subject of this song; and being a song, a poetical composition, it must be in the best and most beautiful language. A translation gives no idea of the excellence of Homer; and beautiful as is this song in our English version, we must remember that it is the poetry of an age more remote than the earliest Greek poets, in a modern language of very different structure and idiom.

The fact that this song is so much rejected is a proof of its excellence. How many persons can see no excellence in the best productions of genius, even when there is about them no allegory, as is here the case, to be interpreted by the Holy Spirit. The better the poetry the more profound the ideas embodied in it, the farther is it above the range of the common mind and the more likely to be appreciated only by the cultivated few whose taste has been carefully refined. This being the Song of Songs

the same thing must be expected here, and to a much greater degree, because there is need of a taste which cannot be attained without the supernatural aid of divine grace. Even when the highest beauty and excellence was personified in Jesus Christ, how perfectly was all this above the comprehension of man. They saw in him no beauty that they should desire him. Isa. liii. 2. His beauty cannot be seen and understood without a taste imparted by the Holy Spirit. "No man can say that Jesus is the Lord but by the Holy Ghost." 1 Cor. xii. 3. Much is said about the Beautiful, the Good and the True. Jesus was the personification of them all. For him, did God represent unto us these abstract spiritual excellences, in a sensible, bodily form. In its loftiest flights, the imagination of man never had so glorious a conception as that which is given in the union of the divine and human natures in the person of Jesus Christ. The object of this song is the celebration of the love which led to that union, its beauty, its attractiveness and its glorious results. Others of the divine songs of scripture celebrate some particular consequences flowing from this love; the song of Moses at the Red Sea, speaks the praise of Jehovah for their deliverance; the Psalms are utterances of pious feeling for various mercies; this song goes to the spring of all that is beautiful, good, and true, and celebrates the love which is the fountain of all blessedness. Homer, generally received as the prince of poets, sings of the malignant passions, the wrath of his hero, the cause of woes unnumbered; this book sings of the wondrous love of God which is the spring, not of desolation, misery, and tears, but of the new creature, the deliverance from guilt, the consolation, the heavenly anticipations that are abroad in our world of woe. It sings of the same love which is the burden of the new song in heaven. How glorious was the chorus, when at the completion of creation, "the morning stars sang together and all the sons of God shouted for joy." Will not that be the song of songs which shall be heard amid the new heavens and the new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness, when the innumerable company of the redeemed and the angels join to celebrate the love of the Lamb that was slain? The theme of this song is the same redeeming love; and those whose hearts are here brought by grace to feel the excellence of this portion of scripture are

already learning that song which no man could learn but those redeemed from the earth.

God can express to us inward spiritual beauty, only through the means of outward, sensible beauty; and in this song, He makes use of this outward beauty for impressing on us that which is inwardly beautiful, true, and good. What beauty is comparable to the beauty of holiness? This is the source of all other beauty. All the deformity, ugliness, and filthiness in this world are owing to the want of holiness. In the heavens where no stain of sin has fallen, there is nothing but beauty. This beauty of holiness is that which the Psalmist so earnestly desired to behold. Ps. xxvii. 4. And the celebration of that beauty in this divine poetry, renders it the song of songs. A few years ago, on a clear winter's night, there burst forth a northern light that suffused the whole heavens with a rosy tinge and threw over the snow and landscape the same unearthly hues, different from anything previously seen, and causing emotions of inexpressible pleasure in those who beheld this transient burst of heavenly splendour—this song, is, as it were, a rosy burst of the divine love which, through the Lamb, is the Shechinah of heaven; and those whose souls have the spiritual perception for seeing the divine light here beaming, feel their hearts thrill with the beauty of the tinge it throws over our blighted and wintry world. Elsewhere there can be seen nothing of equal or like beauty.

It was proper that such a song should be written by Solomon. Aaron having prefigured Christ as a priest, and Moses foreshadowing Him as a prophet, Solomon prefigured Him as a king. And while David represents Jesus as suffering persecution and subduing the enemies of his people, Solomon represents Him as the triumphant prince of peace. Under Solomon the kingdom of Israel was perfectly established by the conquest of all their enemies and by the building of the temple in Jerusalem; and as the camp in the wilderness may represent the church in this world, the reign of Solomon may be a representation of the church in heaven. While therefore David sung in the Psalms of the various conflicts of the Christian life, Solomon here sings of that which is the end of all our conflicts, the consummation of the love of Christ and his church. His mental endowments were as glorious as his position. Not only did

he surpass all others in wealth and splendour, the most kingly of kings; but before him there was none like him for wisdom, neither after him shall any arise like unto him. 1 Kings, iii. 12; and he possessed noble poetic powers. A man combining these rare qualifications, was very properly selected by the Holy Spirit as the means for conveying to the saints this divine allegory, this unequalled song of love.

As the enemy of our souls contests every step of our progress from error into the full light of truth, failing to make us reject this book as uninspired or as improper for the use of the pure in heart, he will be equally satisfied in depriving us of its benefit by leading to a wrong interpretation. Much of the dislike to this song by even Christians, has arisen from the erroneous method pursued in the exposition by some of the most pious commentators. Even a pious man may go astray through a false theory of interpretation. There is no book in the Bible further removed than this song, beyond the capability of an impious man, even of great learning, for giving a proper exposition. There are portions of scripture containing an unadorned statement of doctrine or facts, which a scholar who takes them up as he would an uninspired classic, may interpret fairly, according to the literal meaning. Such a man may be called a commentator on the scriptures; he can hardly be called an expounder of them. It is a dangerous error, and one into which the unsanctified heart is continually liable to fall, that learning is the one essential thing in biblical interpretation. The importance in this work of a well furnished head, may cause us to undervalue the aid necessary from a pious heart. Bringing to the subject of religion our modes of thinking on common topics, we forget that the scriptures have difficulties which require spiritual discernment, no less than philological acumen, and that a man may "understand all mysteries and all knowledge," while destitute of the love which is the key to the solution of its deepest and most edifying problems. The mere philologist and antiquary perform an important work in the business of exposition. It is nothing more than the work of hewing the wood and drawing the water. In religious worship the tendency of the heart, under its corrupt inclinations, is to exalt the ceremonial above the spiritual; and in devotion to the study of the scriptures, we are in danger of exalting the



scientific above the spiritual, of resting in the means rather than in the end, in learned investigation rather than in the spiritual apprehension by the heart, of the truths to which those investigations lead. The enemy of holiness and parent of error cares not in what way he succeeds in keeping us from understanding the truth, whether by inducing us to neglect the essential aids of learning and study, under the fanatical impression that the Spirit will give all needed illumination, without the use of means; or by leaving us to rest in these scientific investigations alone, without the indispensable assistance of the Holy Spirit. Here especially must the well furnished head be found in alliance with a heart controlled by grace. There is no portion of the scriptures which requires more than does this song, a sanctified state of the affections in him who undertakes the interpretation. Without this the marrow of the book cannot be relished or detected. Here especially are things which must be not so much philologically, as spiritually discerned; and which to the natural mind, however learned, without the teaching of the Spirit, must appear as absolute foolishness.

In this song, truth is taught not by didactic statements, but by figurative allusions. As the doctrines relating to the person and work of Jesus, are set forth literally in the New Testament, but are illustrated by the emblems of the Jewish service; so the reciprocal love of Christ and his people, unfolded by plain statements in other portions of the Bible, is here elucidated by poetical imagery and comparisons. The types are correctly interpreted by a knowledge of the doctrines of the New Testament; while those doctrines are in turn, made clear only by intelligent acquaintance with the meaning of types. And the love of the Redeemer and the redeemed, as taught by himself and his inspired disciples, is illustrated in the emblematical language of this song, while at the same time, the key to a knowledge of these instructive figures is found in acquaintance with the divine love here so beautifully elucidated. A single emblem or illustration standing out by itself, is called a type or figure of things to come. When the emblems are multiplied and the figure continued to some length, the whole becomes an allegory. Such is the nature of this book. It is an allegorical illustration of the operations of love in the bosom of the saint and of the Redeemer. Hence, we must not expect to find here any state-

ment of doctrine in a didactic form. We must here search for truth not in the form in which it appears in the epistle to the Romans, but in the guise it assumes in the figures of the Jewish ritual. Beautiful and instructive though the services of the law are to ourselves, how dim was the apprehension Israel had of their significance; and how great is the flood of light poured on them by studying them with the knowledge imparted by God manifest in flesh. As mere poetry, this book has transcendent beauty; but when viewed in the light of the knowledge of the glorious love of God shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost, it assumes a splendour and instructiveness unimagined and unsurpassed.

In the interpretation of this song, there are therefore two separate lines of investigation, bearing upon each other and converging, though perfectly distinct. There is the study of the language, and the study of the allegorical meaning. After knowing all that can be known of the literal import and the customs here referred to, there remains the more important task of determining what are the spiritual truths intended to be conveyed to us in this figurative language. The meaning wrapped up in the folds of the allegory is the main object of search. Hence the commentators who have gone no farther than an elucidation of the literal meaning, even by all the learning that may be here brought to bear, cannot be considered as having expounded this scripture. The meaning of the allegory yet remains untouched; and to the scholar who has gone thus far this meaning may be as perfectly unknown, as is the narrative of the facts there contained, to him who does not understand the language. Biblical learning furnishes the key to a knowledge of a book as a poem; there is another element necessary for giving us a clue to the spiritual meaning embodied in this mystical poetry. The mere literal meaning of the prophecy of Isaiah, was intelligible to the Ethiopian eunuch, and yet he said, How can I understand except some man should guide me. Of whom speaketh the prophet this? of himself, or of some other man? Acts viii. 31. In this song particularly, a knowledge of the letter gives nothing like the meaning of the book without a knowledge of the spirit. The words of Jesus are equally applicable here, "It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you, they

are spirit, and they are life." John vi. 63. This is the key to the whole interpretation of the song. The meek will he teach his way, and he will show them his covenant. The secret of the Lord is with them that fear him; and as without a parable spake our Lord not unto the multitudes, but when they were alone, he expounded all things to his disciples, Mark iv. 54; so must we still, with meekness and godly fear, seek to be alone with him in prayer, that we may ask of him the meaning of the parables contained in the written word, and receive the Holy Ghost that he may teach us all things and guide us into all truth. A fundamental inquiry in studying the song, is, Of whom speaketh Solomon this? of himself or of some other person? And never can we understand what we here read, until, after diligent study and humble meditation, we have the Holy Spirit to begin at the same scripture and preach unto us Jesus. He must open our eyes, before we can behold the wondrous things contained in this portion of God's law. Whatever our knowledge of the word of God, certain it is that our hearts will never burn within us, till Jesus himself opens to us the scriptures. None other can expound to us in all this song, the things concerning himself. The necessity of the influence of the Holy Spirit interpreting divine truth, is taught by Peter, who says we must receive it as a first principle, "That no prophecy of the scripture is of any private\* interpretation." Showing in this passage he had not followed cunningly devised fables, in making known the power and coming of our Lord,—he points out two distinct grounds of confirmation for the truth of the gospel. The first is external, and depends on the testimony of the witnesses who were with him in the holy mount of transfiguration, and were there eye-witnesses of the magnificent glory, and heard the voice of the Father from heaven in attestation of the divinity of the Son. The second is internal, the persuasion which every true believer has of the divine origin of the scriptures, from what he sees and feels of the power of these truths under the influences of the Holy Spirit. This demonstration, this inward witness of the Spirit, is a safer reliance than a voice from heaven—is a more sure word of prophecy, of divine instruction regarding the truth of our faith, an interpretation or

\* *Idios quod animo acquisivimus et possidemus.*

expression of the divine will on which we may more certainly rely. Without at all undervaluing the external evidence, the miracles wrought in confirmation of Christianity, the believer finds, as he grows in grace, that his convictions of the inexpressible excellence of his faith, is felt more and more distinctly to rest, not on the testimony adduced from men, so much as on the words which the Holy Ghost speaketh through the scriptures to his sanctified heart. Divine truth kindleth to a flame by the Spirit which is within his soul as a light shining in a dismal place. To this word, a lamp unto his feet and a light unto his path, he does well to take heed until the shadows of error and sin flee away, until the day dawn and the day star arise in our hearts. But in receiving the advantage and pleasure had from the scriptures thus spiritually discerned, we must start with the essential truth; must know this first, that no prophecy of scripture, no portion of divine instruction there revealed, is of any private interpretation; that is, of an interpretation which may be reached by the exercise of any powers peculiar to the unaided human mind by nature; for as prophecy, or the teachings contained in the scriptures, were not discovered and uttered by the unassisted intellect of man, but were spoken by men borne along by the Holy Ghost; those truths cannot be understood and interpreted by us with the enlightening influences of the same Spirit.

The parable of the sower derives its great interest from its instructiveness through the exposition of our Lord. This application of those simple facts to the illustration of spiritual things, invests them with great beauty. Touching as is the parable of the prodigal son, how greatly is the attractiveness of the narrative heightened when viewed as illustrating the joy there is in heaven over one sinner that repenteth. The types, parables, and allegories of scripture, rich in literary materials, are like the curiously wrought lanterns of oriental countries, which do not reveal their beauty of transparency and emblems till lighted up within; these portions of truth, though a lamp unto our feet and a light unto our path, reveal their excellence, splendour, and power to guide, only when through their divine emblems, streams on us the inner light of the Holy Ghost and the Lamb. An exposition of the sower or the prodigal son, that might go farther than an elucidation of the literal meaning,



without searching for the golden view of spiritual instruction there concealed, might be of use as materials ready to the hand of some other person, but would fail to give an idea of the mind of the Spirit. In all our duties, human agency must be blended with divine coöperation. In raising the fruits of the earth, there is a duty for the husbandman, and there is an influence that can be supplied only by the Creator, and in spiritual things, Paul may plant and Apollos water, but God gives the increase; so in interpreting the scriptures, in this song more especially than any other part of them, there is a work to be done by the mind in gathering all that can be furnished from the stores of biblical learning; and besides this, there must be the aid of the Holy Ghost for rendering our efforts perfect and successful. Here learning can go no further than the threshold; the key by which the mysteries within are reached, must be furnished by the Spirit of God. Like the tabernacle, beautiful in the eyes of the spectator, with its sides overlaid with gold, the song unsurpassed in poetic excellence may fix the admiration of even an unrenewed mind, but when the soul is admitted into the recesses of its interior meaning, and the hand of the Holy Spirit lifts the mysterious veil, we gaze with the trepidation of holy affection on something more entrancing than the ark of the covenant, the cherubim, and the human form seen amid the cloud of glory. Hence, says Leighton, the true experimental knowledge of Christ's loveliness and the Christian's love is the best commentary on the whole strain of this allegorical song. Fanaticism and ignorance may undervalue the indispensable and fundamental assistance supplied by learning, but the mind best instructed by the Holy Spirit will be best able to use these aids aright without either unduly exalting them or treating them with neglect.

The error into which many pious commentators have fallen, seems to have sprung mainly from the attempt to make too much out of the allegory. In expounding the types, some of the most learned and pious among the old divines, are greatly at fault by the extremes to which they have pushed their principle of interpretation. They appear almost to think that every thing must be a type in which there can be found even a remote comparison; and in those things which are really types, seek for numerous resemblances evidently not intended

by the Holy Spirit. As might be expected, this principle has been carried beyond all reasonable bounds in their efforts to expound this song. A controlling impression with them seems to be, that every thing must be drawn from this figurative language, that can be devised by a lively fancy in alliance with a spiritual heart. The duty of an interpreter of scripture is to search for the mind of the Spirit. The facts and personages, the services and figures of the word of God, may receive applications well nigh innumerable by way of accommodation and illustration, but these uses of sacred truth, however pleasing and instructive, should not be the leading aim of a commentator. Much of what is intended for exposition of the types, viewed as such an exposition, is perfectly worthless, but viewed as an ingenious improvement of scripture, is edifying and attractive. The use of a fact or allusion as a mere literary embellishment or illustration, may be allowable and profitable, when the same fact put forth in the same way authoritatively as a type, would be a perversion of scripture. And when the analogies of the real types are carried too far, we are perverting the scriptures. In every parable and allegory, there is some leading principle running through the illustration, and for this principle we must search, without expecting to find similitudes in the minor incidents introduced as necessary appendages to the narrative. There can be no better models for us to follow in interpreting allegorical scriptures than the exposition given by our Saviour of the parables of the sower and of the tares of the field.

Perhaps nothing has done more to bring this book into disrepute than the well meant but ill-judged efforts of pious men to draw some hidden meaning from almost every word. They could hardly have been more minute in dissecting and weighing the didactic portions of the epistles. Their expositions are often so overloaded with ingenious appropriations of these figures, as to crowd out of sight the one leading truth designed to be taught by the Spirit. Even with the best trained imagination, this principle must draw the expositor into offences against good taste. "Every word of God is pure. The words of the Lord are pure words, as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times." Nothing can therefore be clearer than the truth, that any interpretation of this inspired allegory, which is in the

least contrary to delicacy and correctness of taste, cannot be the true expression of its meaning. The inspiration of this book is established beyond all cavil; as the word of God it must therefore be very pure. The word of God must be consistent with its author and consistent with itself. In consequence of the peculiar manner in which truth is taught by allegory, any interpretation of this book must be wrong which does not harmonize with the rest of the scriptures. Here we must keep in mind the direction, "Prophecy according to the proportion of faith," understanding it, as we do, to mean, Interpreting the language of revelation, the will of God, according to the standard of things believed as gathered from the general tenor of revelation. By adhering to this principle, exercising good taste, and not trying to draw too much from the figures, while seeking humbly the guidance of the Holy Spirit, we shall find every anticipated indelicacy to vanish.

The words of ch. i. verse 13 may be taken as an example. Unto those who believe Jesus is precious, his presence is delightful. We are asked the question, how precious, how agreeable, is the society of our Lord? What are the sensations of pleasure like, that we have in his presence? We reply, what are the sensations of delight you experience from a cluster of camphire blossoms or from the fragrance of a bundle of myrrh so sweet that you love to have it dwelling in your bosom? Now the delights shed abroad in our soul by the presence of Jesus, are more pleasant than the exquisite delights thus received through the bodily senses. Such is the language necessary from our present position in the flesh, that we must use, such comparisons or say nothing concerning the loveliness of the presence of Jesus. We imagine that the passages describing the pleasure had by our Lord in contemplating the redeemed soul, ch. iv. 1-5, ch. vi. 4-7, ch. vii. 1-5, and the illustration of the beauty and loveliness of Christ, ch. v. 10-16, were not intended to be dissected so minutely as they have been by some commentators. Like the description of the New Jerusalem, these are representations of spiritual things by clusters of the richest emblems. The elegance and force of such a passage is lost by taking it to pieces and turning the fragments in every imaginable direction for finding in them various shades and views of allegory. It is as unreasonable as tearing a rose to pieces and examining it leaf

by leaf for getting at its beauty, or as breaking portions from a piece of statuary, instead of surveying it as constituting a finished whole. The use to which the emblems in such a description may be applied for illustrating truth by way of accommodation, is one thing; the leading intention had by the Holy Spirit in inditing the passage is another. The latter is what we must seek for in the interpretation of the book. The appearance of our Lord to John at Patmos was for representing emblematically the offices now sustained by him as ascended, in behalf of his persecuted people. Hence the garment down to the foot and the girdle about the breast, show him to be a still, a merciful, and gracious High Priest; his head and hairs white like wool, bespeak the eternity of the son of God manifest in the human form of Jesus of Nazareth; his eyes as a flame of fire, denote his omniscience. The exhibition given of him in the Song, ch. v. 10-16, is confined to the single idea of illustrating his loveliness. When a beautiful object is contemplated, the sight of it raises within the mind a train of pleasing emotions. The more these emotions are multiplied, the more intense must be our pleasure. The sight of the Lord Jesus as contemplated by faith, calls up within the soul clusters of ideas of the greatest beauty, and emotions of the greatest pleasure. No one thing will illustrate his loveliness, and therefore many objects of beauty are brought together, and they show by their diversity the variety of shades of beauty there is in Christ. The white and ruddy colour, the most fine gold, and raven's locks, the eyes of doves by rivers of water, the bed of spices and sweet flowers, the gold rings set with beryl, the white ivory overlaid with sapphires, the pillars of marble set on sockets of fine gold, the majesty of Lebanon with the excellency of its cedars; each one of these objects separately pours into the mind a rich stream of beautiful ideas; each reference or emblem forms by itself a pleasing study; all these objects combined and viewed at once, if this were possible, would flood and overpower the heart with beauty. Now when the inquiry is made, What is the beauty of Christ, of which so much is heard? the Holy Spirit says, view these different objects each of which is so beautiful, gather into your mind all the ideas of splendour they shadow forth, contemplate them collectively; and then, with your mind thus dazzled and drunk with beauty, think that the single view of



Christ alone raises in the soul an overflowing flood of beautiful ideas, visions, and conceptions, so deep, so rich, so captivating, that all these things with all their resplendent beauty, can only serve unitedly as one great and glorious but comparatively dim emblem, for representing the beauty of Jesus. The essential thing the mind must search for in this allegorical description is the loveliness of our Lord.

The blessed Saviour thinks of us far more constantly and far more fervently than we, even in hours of deepest emotions, think of him; he contemplates us with far more steadiness and intense interest than we can contemplate Him. How could he illustrate to us the beauty he sees in the saints, the work of his hands as well as the purchase of his blood? How tell the pleasure he has in dwelling on our souls in process of sanctification? Only by illustrations from the beauties seen around us in the world. The eyes of doves, the flock of goats on Mount Gilead, the flock of sheep coming up from the washing, the thread of scarlet, the piece of pomegranate, the majestic tower of David, whereon hung a thousand shields, the twin roes feeding among the lilies, the city Tirzah situated beautifully on Judah's hills, Jerusalem on Mount Zion, magnificent for situation, the jewels wrought by the hands of a cunning workman, the heap of wheat set about with lilies, the tower of ivory, the limpid fish-pools in Heshbon, the tower of Lebanon which looketh towards Damascus, Carmel crowned with verdure and flowers, the stately palm trees with clusters of grapes, the fairness of the moon, the clearness of the sun, the grandeur of an army with banners; all these things are beautiful in themselves, and on any one of them we can dwell long with great pleasure; what is the measure of the beauty pouring into our mind from them all combined? Yet the Lord Jesus says by his Spirit, that all the pleasure we can have from contemplating all these objects is nothing more than a shadow of the pleasure He has in dwelling on the character and ripening graces of his saints. It is no part of our duty to let the imagination so carry us away from the direct line of interpretation as to inquire what there is in the renewed soul answering to the teeth in the body, and why believers "have not such teeth as lions and tigers, but such as sheep have, nor tusks like dogs and ravenous beast, but

even shorn.”\* ch. iv. 2; as to inquire what is meant by the head of Jesus and in what respects that head resembles the most fine gold; in these and in all other particulars of the descriptions here given, the material point of the comparison lies in the beauty of the impression made and the pleasure thereby excited. The spiritual beauty of Christ could not be set forth intelligibly to our dull and carnal comprehension, otherwise than by reference to the beauty of the human form; the same is true concerning the beauty of the renovated soul of man; and it may assuredly encourage and gratify us to know that the soul of the believer excites in the bosom of Jesus, and the loveliness of Christ excites in the heart of the saint, deeper emotions of beauty and delight than can spring from the contemplation of all the objects of splendour mentioned in these descriptions, combined in one dazzling group.

Truth lies amid the beauties of allegory as the clusters of grapes hang among the branches and leaves of the vine; and as the good husbandman, instead of cutting down the vine and manufacturing it into various shapes according to his peculiar fancy, will gather the fruit and leave the branches untouched, we are using allegories aright only when gathering carefully the clusters of truth hid in their rich and luxuriant folds. This Song is a beautiful bough, even a fruitful bough by a well,—a choice vine brought out of heaven and planted by the spiritual brook of Eshcol, those waters of life along which are found those trees of life, the diversified books of the scriptures. He who gave us this spiritual vine growing so luxuriant over the fountain of the waters of the Holy Spirit for our refreshment in this valley of Baca on our weary pilgrimage to the heavenly Zion, intended that we should gather the fruit not that we should break and destroy the branches,—and that with leaf that never withers these fruits however frequently gathered by passing pilgrims should still bud forth in fresh and ripening clusters, beautiful and reviving to each successive generation even to the end of the world. Much is said about the indelicacy of this poem; but these objections have arisen less from an examination of the book on its own merits, than from looking at the fancies of commentators. With the best intentions, many

of these men instead of trying to soften down and accommodate to present views any expressions apparently too glowing for our days, seem to have exerted their ingenuity for getting from it as many amatory ideas as possible. What we mean may be seen by referring to Bishop Henry's "Commentary." We are free to say that after reading, studying, and meditating on the Song for years, we had never entertained the faintest suspicion that some passages are to be understood in their literal sense; according to his gross and offensive explanations. Let any person who is disposed to find fault with this portion of scripture, take it and read it as it appears to an unprejudiced mind unoccupied with any theories, and then let him read what has been made out of it by commentators; and we are confident he will feel that the Holy Spirit has woven the allegory of a beautiful and delicate texture, and that the offensiveness imputed to it, arises from the perversion of man. We are unable to understand what good can possibly arise from such representations as those of Bishop Percy. But they do positive injury. They degrade the scriptures in the estimation of the irreligious; and they infest the pious mind with associations of which it can be with difficulty divested and which might never have arisen without this foreign aid. Even in the commentaries of such men as Gill and Durham, amid so much that is spiritual and edifying there are interpretations offensive to every thing like good taste, and the more to be regretted because irrelevant, unnecessary, and incorrect. Like the miracles of the fabulous gospels, in contrast with the narrative of the Evangelists, many of the efforts of the human mind on this Song, in comparison with the simplicity of the language, not in the English version, but in the original Hebrew,—show with what superiority the Holy Spirit manages so delicate a subject.

Much of the learning gathered around this subject contributes little, if at all, to that spiritual understanding of the Song, which is the ultimate end of its inspiration. The history of the interpretation of the scriptures gives a pitiable exhibition of the workings of error in the human mind. There is hardly a passage without a variety of interpretations, opinions, and fancies engrafted on it; of these notions this book has received no ordinary share. So far from being able to discover divine truth by its unaided powers, how

does the mind pervert these truths when revealed, and weave from them the most silly dreams. The surmises concerning the structure of the Song, as stated by Bossuet and adopted by Bishop Percy; the fanciful conjectures of Taylor are worth very little save as a literary curiosity connected with the history of the book. It matters not whether the Song combines the characteristics of the Greek drama; whether it contains according to regular divisions the actions of the seven distinct days allotted to the celebration of the Jewish nuptials; or whether, according to Dr. Good, it consists of twelve sacred idyls. Nor is it necessary to spend time in determining the truth or falsity of the opinions that it was written to celebrate the marriage of Solomon; that the bride was the daughter of Pharaoh; or even that the circumstances here recorded are undoubted. Were these points settled beyond all cavil, they could not throw a single ray of light on the spiritual meaning of the allegory. The truths intended to be taught remain the same whether the incidents had existence in reality or in imagination. What benefit could be derived from our knowing there was a specific individual designated in the parable of the sower, who he was, what was his name? The truths and duties inculcated by our Lord, in Luke xix. 12—27, receive no additional force from knowing that the nobleman mentioned was the son of Herod, and the far country to which he went was the city of Rome. The beauty and instructiveness of the allegory in Spenser's *Fairy Queen* are no more delightful and profitable, to him who sees in the different sketches portraits of Queen Elizabeth, Sir Philip Sidney and others, than to him who may happily read the same poetry, ignorant of any such historical allusions. The very nature of an allegory renders it perfectly unimportant whether the incidents be real or imaginary.

We have deemed it more profitable and natural in meditating on this book, to view the bride as the representative of the individual believer rather than of the whole church. As the church is a collection of individuals, its state must be that of the members composing it; and no distinction can be drawn between the love of Jesus for the collective body and his love for the several persons constituting the whole mass. In the glorious temple of revelation, a place which the Lord our God has chosen to cause his name to dwell even in brighter glory than



in the temple of the material world, does this book stand like one of the apartments in the temple on Mount Zion, small indeed, but exquisitely finished, the walls and ceiling of something richer than cedar, richer than bright ivory overlaid with sapphires, and filled with specimens of truth brought down from heaven by the Holy Spirit and here deposited for the comfort and delight of those who love the habitation of God's house and the place where his glory dwelleth. As the man skilled in geology will take a bone of fossil remains from a by-gone world, and from this alone restore the whole fabric of the creature to which it belonged, with a knowledge of its nature and instincts, so may we take the germs of truth, the heavenly fossils laid up for us with such care in the spiritual treasury of this Song, and taught by the Holy Spirit, our souls may develope the system of heavenly love, the mutual affection of Jesus and his saints, a love not native to our earth in its present fallen state, but existing in all the vigour and fulness of an immortal life in yonder heavenly world.

ART. III.—1. *The Constitution of Man*, by George Combe—on Secretiveness. See index.

2. *The Covenant and Official Organ of the Grand Lodge of the United States*. Vol. I. 1842. p. 97, on "The Secret Principle."

3. *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. 7th Ed. Art. Mysteries.

OUR present object will be to discuss the principle of secrecy in its relations to man's moral and religious obligations. This inquiry is rendered necessary by the rapid extension and multiplication of secret societies of every kind, and the efforts which have been made to justify them upon the ground of philosophy and religion.

The love of secrecy it is said "is an element in the constitution of mind" and "must therefore, in some mode or other, find its appropriate and lawful exercise."\* "Secrecy is a virtue," says another, "a thing never yet denied."†

Now to begin with the beginning of our subject, we deny

\* *The Covenant*, p. 97.

† *Freemason's Monitor*.

both of these axiomatic and fundamental data. Secrecy is neither an element of mind nor is it a virtue. Secrecy is a quality of an action, or a state and condition. It is a state of separation, concealment or of being hid from view.\* "It is," says Dr. Johnson, "a state of privacy, solitude, retirement. A thing set apart, removed, withdrawn out of sight or view, hidden, concealed, private, is secret."†

Now the love of such a state of isolated separation is not a part of man's nature. It is, on the contrary, opposed to that nature, and painful to it. "It is not good for man to be alone," and hence the social principle, developing itself in love and friendship, in the family and in society, is the chief and characteristic distinction of human nature. It is only "use," as Shakspeare says, that "doth breed the habit in any man"

"The shadowy desert, unfrequented woods,  
To better brook, than flourishing peopled towns."

This a man may do to "tune his distresses and record his woes," but the truth still remains, that

"In solitude  
What happiness who can enjoy alone,  
Or if enjoying, what contentment find."‡

Nay, another great poet has said that solitude is but a slight relief from pain, and that

"The vacant bosom's wilderness,  
Might thank the pang that made it less,  
E'en bliss 'twere wo alone to bear."

Man is not then naturally disposed to be secret in any sense. He is on the contrary naturally social, free, open, unreserved, communicative and candid. These, beyond controversy, are the universal, unvaried, and proverbial qualities of natural and unsophisticated childhood. For a child to love solitude is unnatural, and to be secret and reserved impossible. An ability to endure retirement, to exercise reserve and to maintain secrecy, is a power which man attains with great difficulty, after long experience of the selfishness and evil of his fellow-men,—after much training and indoctrination,—and, after all, in a very feeble and imperfect degree. This is proven by the universal complaints respecting the faithlessness of men. Dr. Johnson

\* Webster.

† Richardson's Dictionary.

‡ Milton.

doubted therefore whether the quality of retention be generally bestowed, and supposed that commonly secrets were unnatural and incapable of retention.\* Chesterfield thought able men alone could exercise secrecy and that mystery was the only secrecy of weak and cunning ones, that is, of the great mass, and he advises therefore that neither fools, knaves, nor young men should be entrusted with them. The use of the word secrecy to express inviolate fidelity to any trust, is the very latest meaning to which it has been appropriated.† This use of the word is derivative, secondary, and figurative, and it indicates, not the primitive and natural condition of society, but that which is most advanced in civilization and philosophy.

Secrecy therefore is not a virtue nor an element of mind and it is perfectly gratuitous to affirm that it is so. No philosopher or divine has ever laid down such a proposition. Until phrenologists undertook to make out every state and exercise of the human mind, and to provide for them a "local habitation and a name" among the cerebral functions, in what system of mental or moral science, ancient or modern, is secrecy enrolled among the principles or the virtues of the mind? It cannot be: because it is a state not an act—a means not an end. No man conceals himself for the mere purpose of being secret, but he is secret because he has a purpose in being so, to accomplish which this is necessary. The truth is, that as the quality of an action or a state of mind, secrecy is neither virtuous nor vicious. The principles on which it rests, and the motives by which it is maintained, give to secrecy the azure hue of virtue, the blackness of vice, or the perfectly colourless atmosphere of indeterminate moral character. Mr. Combe manufactures a faculty of secretiveness out of those of judgment, prudence and will, by which it is that a man is capable of self-restraint and of doing or not doing, speaking or not speaking, according to his view of duty and advantage. With him, however, the principle is supremely selfish,‡ or has in it no moral character whatever.||

\* See Rambler, No. 13.

† See Johnson, &c, as above.

‡ As "a moral sentiment" it is represented as aiming at the suppression of all that might injure us with others, and at getting hold of every secret by which we may increase our influence and power. But "in itself it does not in any respect desire the benefit of others." p. 62.

|| "In reference to external objects it is the power of restraining the internal activities of our powers." p. 76.

The love of secrecy implies a state of moral evil, probation and defect. It is only here "we see in part and know in part," and that a veil is drawn around every human heart. It was not so in Paradise. It is not so in heaven, and it will not be so in the Paradise regained. The love of secrecy is in itself considered, an evil and an imperfection. It is a necessity imposed by the introduction and prevalence of sin and all its viperous brood of selfish, unbrotherly and vindictive passions. It was only when man became by sin the enemy of man, that he became afraid of him and therefore reserved, cautious, and secret. In proportion as wickedness prevails men "love darkness rather than light," and wrap themselves around with the garment of concealment. Secrecy is therefore the shield of weakness, the refuge of the oppressed, the altar of the assailed, and the resistance of the enslaved. Where purity dwells it is unnecessary. Where there is peace it is a stranger. Where there is mutual love and confidence, and honorable preference of each other it is needless. And in proportion as the heavenly spirit and principles of religion prevail, and peace, purity, integrity, generosity, disinterested benevolence, and philanthropy shall become personally and universally, the characteristics of mankind, the existence and operation of secrecy will be limited to pure and benign purposes. We now hide much in our bosoms only because there is much which we ought to conceal, and dare not unveil. And secrecy is now a wide-spread principle in business, in politics, in arts and commerce, because it is found to be absolutely essential against the craft, the cunning, the circumvention and the unprincipled selfishness and rapaciousness of human nature.

The origin of secrecy as a quality of human conduct is therefore truly, though suicidally, stated in the organ of the Odd Fellows, when it is said that "it was manifested in the bowers of Eden, where its undue operation, "brought death into the world and all our woes."\* (See Gen. iii. 5, 6.) The Freemason's Guide also traces this principle to the very beginning of time,† and very curiously admits that the order certainly included Cain; received its first name from the builders of Babel, and was zealously promoted by Nimrod or Belus in founding

\* The Covenant.

†



his empire.\* The author, however, was certainly unphilosophical in assigning the origin of the order to God as the first "Grand Architect,"† since all his dealings were then open and unreserved, and since a grand architect had actually found his unnoticed way into the garden of Eden, and under the garb of secrecy had seduced our first parents into apostacy, and thus given origin to the principle and practice of secrecy. These writers cannot therefore be contradicted when they teach that from that time to this the love of secrecy has characterized fallen, guilty, fearful, artful, cunning, deceitful and wicked man, in all ages, in all countries, and under all forms of government and religion; and for this reason, that these evils came by sin, and as all men have sinned, all are partakers of them.

Secrecy is to the nature of man what darkness is to the natural world. It is a negation, a privation. It is the absence and inactivity of its regular functions and operations. It limits and restrains. Like darkness it is doubtless made conducive to good ends. It is adapted to cover up what, if left exposed, might prutify and breed corruption; to allay and put to rest stormy winds of passion that might agitate and convulse; to disarm malice of its sting, envy of its hatred, jealousy of its revenge, wealth of its ostentation and poverty of its curse. It is to human nature what drapery is to a dilapidated room, or costume to a very homely person. It veils what would disgust, and reveals only what may please. It hides deformity and exposes what is becoming. It covers the shame and the nakedness of humanity, obscures what is "earthly, sensual and devilish" in our nature, and throws over our defects the mantle of charity.

To every man individually secrecy may be made a means of defence and of self-preservation. It enables us also to "make the worse appear the better," the bad tolerable, and the good attractive. We can thus think the kindlier of ourselves because we are esteemed by others. It is sometimes also a shield of defence. It parries many a hard thrust, and turns aside many a deadly weapon. By avoiding the occasion of offence, it prevents the thirst for revenge. But on the other hand secresy is as potent for evil as it is for good. If it is pal-

\* The Freemason's Monitor, p. 17, 18.

† Do. p. 17.

liative and protective it is not less pernicious. It puts the dagger into the assassin's hands, envelopes him in darkness, and thus gives him the opportunity of unerring aim and of unre-dressed wickedness. It enables a man to plot mischief upon his bed, to harbour traitorous and even murderous passions, to support within him all manner of evil purposes, and crafty, tricky, mean and overreaching plans, and to make his heart like a den of thieves, or a cage of unclean birds, or like the house of those wicked spirits whose name is legion, and thus to appear outwardly as fair as the whited sepulchre, while all within is rottenness.

To society at large, as to individuals, secrecy is available for much both of good and evil; it is a wholesome check and preventive of vice, and at the same time an incentive and patron of its utmost excess of riot. It gives to law and justice the hundred eyes of Argus, and yet puts into the hands of law-breakers the hundred hands of Briareus. It is the club of Hercules by whosoever hands it is wielded. Without it society could not be defended, and with it that society can be grievously wounded and bruised. It is, in short, a two-edged sword, powerful for evil as well as good. Thus is it evident as we have said, that secrecy has in itself no moral character, and is a state or condition which becomes virtuous or vicious according to the motive and end for which it is employed.

From what we have said it may be inferred that the proper field for the exercise of secrecy is where the true and rightful interests of man, individually and socially, are involved. As it regards man individually it may be remarked that what is not necessary to be revealed for the good of others and what may prove injurious to ourselves, we ought to leave in undisturbed secrecy. What the good of others however demands we ought not to conceal from them. This is the only limit to personal secrecy, the law of truth, honour, probity, justice, and humanity. But it is, we apprehend, different in society. Society is constituted with a reference to the common good of each other and of all. It is one body of which there are many members, and in which the common health and vigour is maintained by that which every limb and joint and muscle supplieth. If any member of the body is necessary to perform requisite, but at the same time private and homely offices it is on that very account

uncomely and shameful." Secrecy in the conduct of social affairs is a necessity not a choice, an indispensable instrument but not an ornament, like the drains of a city which are covered from public view. No part of the social body is designedly, and for its own sake, secret. Secrecy is the exception to the rule, "a needs be"—which the moral maladies of the body to some extent renders unavoidable. It is only lawful and proper, therefore, where it is a means to the one end of all society, that is, to the common good of all. The propriety of secrecy in a community "hath this extent, no more." Beyond this, it is the badge of despotism and of inquisitorial power. And hence secrecy may be regarded as no bad standard of the character of any government. In arbitrary governments it is the rule, but in free countries it is the exception and the last resort of prudential necessity. In a free republic like ours everything is and ought to be open, public, and revealed. All participate in the government; all share equally in its benefits and its burdens; are labourers in the common vineyard; and all are under obligations to devote themselves to the common interests of the whole body. Local, sectional, and party association for the special benefit of some to the neglect of others and under the covering of secrecy, is contrary to the genius of our constitution, to the spirit of our laws, and to the etherial temper of our institutions. It is without excuse, unnecessary, and injurious. There is but one "order" in a republic—one "fraternity." "All we are brethren." Our equality of right relates not merely to person, to property, and to the pursuit of happiness, but also to the right of knowing the truth as it regards the nature, rules, and order of every society amongst us. This right, if not jural, is moral. It is necessary to that fraternity, and equality, and to that confidence, trust, and heartfelt sympathy, which are essential to the good will and harmony of the social family. While therefore it may be legal it is certainly not morally expedient or desirable that any part of the social family, dwelling in the same homestead, and having common interests at stake, should separate themselves for their own benefit, and under a veil of absolute secrecy "hide themselves from their own flesh," their own kindred.

It is very certain that as what is allowable in one party is allowable in all, and what is proper for one purpose is equally so for others, that in this way the social family may be divided

into cliques, each occupying a separate chamber, and pursuing separate ends for selfish advantages, under rules of absolute and complete seclusion. And how, we ask, could a family thus separated by secret vows, for private benefit and pleasure, live in peace, harmony and happiness, and how could a kingdom thus torn and divided within itself possibly endure?

But secrecy is not less injurious to friendship than it is to social equality and fraternity. Cicero long ago remarked that secrecy is the ruin of friendship, and an effectual barrier to its foundation. And as in a family there should exist the most tender friendship, there must also exist the most perfect freedom. Secrecy openly avowed would at once erect a wall of separation, and thus chill and freeze the warm current of mutual affection. And so it is in the social as well as in the domestic family. Here all are friends and secrecy is a crime against humanity and the very life of all society.

But secrecy is a still greater violation of the rights of love. For if friendship thus knits society into one body, how much more does love identify the interests of those who are its objects. The very bond of such an union is a community of interest, of happiness and of purpose. The manifest good of others, can alone warrant an infringement of this covenant. The creation therefore of conventional associations which exalt their claims above this supremacy of love, and without absolute and imperative necessity, erect between its objects, an open and avowed wall of separation and of secrecy, is, we apprehend a serious, a fatal, and an unjustifiable interference with the claims of true and whole-hearted love; with the duties of man and the rights of woman; with all the sanctity of that holy relation which requires a man to "leave father and mother and cleave unto his wife," and which "out of twain makes them one flesh." The authority of God and the real interests of others which might lie jeopardized by disclosure will even in such a case undoubtedly justify and even require the withholdment of certain facts; but nothing can justify the subjection of that heart which has been given in covenant devotion and in supreme and entire appropriation to a heart equally and entirely consecrated to it, to the usurped dominion of a self constituted society.

Secrecy is not therefore a virtue, or in itself considered, proper and commendable. If the object aimed at in any social



combination is praiseworthy then the veil of secrecy is unnecessary, and if that end is evil or liable to corruption then it is criminal.\* "We should never," says Cicero,† "do any thing out of the hope or expectation of secrecy." "There is," he says, "such a thing as a mutual relation and society amongst all men." . . . "It is true not to tell a thing, is not properly to conceal it; but not to tell that, which people are concerned to know, merely for the sake of some advantage to yourself, I think is: and there is nobody but knows what concealing this is, and who they are that make a custom of it: I am sure not your plain, sincere, ingenuous, honest, and good sort of people; but rather your shifting, sly, cunning, deceitful, roguish, crafty, foxish, juggling kind of fellows. And must it not necessarily be unprofitable for any man to lie under this, and a much longer catalogue, of such black and most odious names of vices?"

Secrecy instead of being in itself a virtue is we contend burdensome and a temptation both to the giver and the receiver; both to the holder and to the recipient. It subjects them to many dangerous equivocations. It cultivates a jesuitical double-dealing with the truth. It cherishes the positive wrong of denying to another his moral right to know the truth. It accustoms a man to convey a false impression, and thus to violate the principle of truth without openly lying. It teaches a man how to use language which conveys one meaning to the hearer while he attributes to it another. It gives to a private and conventional society the authority and power to limit, qualify and restrain promises made previously, made absolutely, made to God and to man. It justifies open or implied falsehood, falsehood by direct misstatement or falsehood by equivocation, and all this in order to preserve a conventional secrecy; and thus it habituates a man to do evil that good may come, and to tarnish his soul with a moral stain at the expense of sacred truth and inviolable love and friendship.‡

Secrecy therefore where it is not made imperative for the good of others, or for our own benefit, and where the interests of others are not at stake, is at war with the very principles of

\* See Wollaston's *Religion of Nature*, p. 265.

† *De officiis*, B III., ch. 8 to 13.

‡ See Whewell's *Morals*, Vol. I, p. 222, 272, 280-282, and Bp. Hall's *Wks.*, vol. 6, p. 32, Johnson's *Rambler*, No. 13.

society; is destructive of the equality, fraternity and social rights of a free republic, is suicidal to the claims of friendship, and of love; and is seriously detrimental to the moral character of those who are under its yoke. Absolute and unqualified, and unconditional secrecy is in its very nature and under all circumstances immoral, unchristian, anti-social and subversive of every interest of truth, of justice, and of righteousness.\* "The love of our country," says Cicero, "must swallow up all other loves whatever,"† and no vow or promise or oath or secrecy can justify the withholdment of that which the interests of truth, or justice, or common good require to be made known.‡ This right of society is acknowledged and not denied. "It is," says Mr. Porter,§ "a right of self-protection, a right inherent in all society to know the principles and aims of any association which may be organized in its midst." But where the whole interior, economy, order and proceedings of such a society are veiled under inviolable secrecy, this right is manifestly denied. The secret doings may for aught the public can tell, contravene all published statements, and in many, very many, cases have done so. The character of any society is determined not by its rules but by its members, and hence the noblest ends under the wisest constitutions may be and often have been, employed as the cover for the most immoral, injurious and iniquitous proceedings. But of secret societies, it is our intention to speak in another article.

---

#### ART. IV.—*The Apostleship a Temporary Office.*

IN a former article we endeavoured to show that the Apostolic office was not meant to be perpetual; first, because the continuance of the office is nowhere explicitly asserted; secondly, because the name Apostle, in its strict and proper sense, is not applied in the New Testament to any who were not of the original thirteen; thirdly, because the qualifications for the

\* See Baxter's Wks., vol. 6, p. 418.

† Offices, B. i., ch. 17.

‡ Baxter, vol. 6, p. 413.

§ Oration before the Order of O. F., Charleston, 1844, p. 21.

Apostleship, as a permanent office in the church, are nowhere stated.

A fourth argument against the perpetuity of the Apostolic office is, that no peculiar apostolic powers are said in scripture to have been exercised by any person, who was not either an original Apostle or a Presbyter.

The only cases which have been alleged are those of Timothy and Titus, and the allegation, with respect to them, is founded not upon the historical statements of the New Testament, but on the instructions given them by Paul, from his epistles addressed to them respectively. Let this fact be duly noted, and borne in mind, when we examine the proof from the epistles. If, in the Acts of the Apostles, Timothy and Titus appeared as the equals and colleagues of Paul, this would create a presumption in favour of their having been Apostles; and this presumption would materially influence the interpretation of his epistles to them; that is to say, expressions of a dubious import might be fairly interpreted so as to agree with the presumption afforded by the history. But what is the true state of the case in this respect? The first mention of Timothy is in Acts xvi. 1, where we read that Paul "came to Derbe and Lystra, and behold a certain disciple was there, named Timotheus, the son of a certain woman which was a Jewess and believed, but his father was a Greek, which was well reported of by the brethren that were at Lystra and Iconium. Him would Paul have to go forth with him, and took and circumcised him, because of the Jews which were in those quarters, for they all knew that his father was a Greek."

In the subsequent narrative it is hard to tell whether Timothy is represented as performing even ordinary ministerial functions, as Silas was also in Paul's company, and the plural forms of speech employed may be restricted to these two. In the account of the persecution at Philippi, (Acts xvi. 12, &c.,) Timothy is not mentioned, and in ch. xvii. 4, 10, "Paul and Silas" are mentioned without Timothy, who was still in their company, however, as appears from Acts xvii. 14, 15; xviii. 5. The omission of his name seems to show that he was not so intimately related to Paul, at this time, as Silas was. The office of Timothy would indeed appear to have been precisely that which John sustained in Paul's first mission, namely, that

of an ὑπηρέτης, an attendant (Acts xiii. 5). And accordingly we find Timothy and Erastus afterwards described by an equivalent expression, δύο τῶν διακονούντων αὐτῷ, (Acts xix. 22). They are called *ministers*, not of God (2 Cor. vi. 4), not of Christ (xi. 23), not of the gospel (Eph. iii. 7), not of the New Testament (2 Cor. iii. 6), not of the church (Col. i. 25), but of Paul, i. e. personal attendants on him. Or if they were *ministers* in a higher sense, their relative position, with respect to Paul was that of δίακονοι to an official superior. Timothy next appears as the fifth in a list of Paul's companions on his return from Greece to Syria (Acts xx. 4), in which list Silas, Paul's colleague in the mission, is not included. These are all the traces which we find of Timothy in the Acts of the Apostles; and in these, he acts no other part than that of an attendant upon Paul.

That he became a preacher of the gospel, a διάκονος in the higher sense, an elder, is admitted. Hence in the epistle to the Romans (xvi. 21), Paul speaks of him as his "work-fellow," a title, however, which would not have been inapplicable to him, even as a lay attendant. In the second epistle to the Corinthians, he mentions him twice, once as his "beloved son and faithful in the Lord," (ch. iv. 17), and again as "one that worketh the work of the Lord, as I also do." (ch. xvi. 10). That this does not imply official equality between them as Apostles, may be argued (1) from the fact, that the terms are perfectly applicable to the ordinary work of the ministry, (2) from the fact, that the phrase "worketh the work of the Lord" is more applicable to the ordinary work of the ministry than to peculiar apostolic functions, (3) from the fact, that in this very epistle, (ch. iv. 17, xvi. 10, 11), Paul directs the movements of Timothy, as those of an inferior.

In the second epistle to the Corinthians, Timothy is mentioned in the title as follows: "Paul, an Apostle of Jesus Christ, by the grace of God, and Timothy the brother." If Timothy had been then an Apostle, could there have been a more appropriate occasion so to call him? Could it well have been avoided? And if the mention of his apostolic character had been neglected once, could the omission be repeated as it is in the title of Colossians? It may indeed be said that in the title of the epistle to Philemon, Paul is called "a prisoner of Jesus Christ," and Timothy "a brother," whereas both were



prisoners. But in Hebrews xiii. 23, an epistle of the same date, it is said, "know ye that our brother Timothy is set at liberty;" not to mention that *δεσμώτης* is no title of office like *ἀπόστολος*.

This argument from the use of the word "brother," where "Apostle" might have been expected, has been very summarily set aside as follows. "Why does Paul in some places call himself an Apostle, and Timothy only a brother? . . . Really it is too late to inquire; but the fact has not the least bearing on the point in question. The Apostles were brethren to each other, the elders were brethren of the Apostles, so were the deacons; so were the laity. The circumstance, therefore, of Paul's calling Timothy a brother, while he calls himself an Apostle, proves no more that Timothy was not an Apostle, than it does that he was not a clergyman at all, but only a layman.\*" This explanation takes for granted, that the argument, to which it is an answer, depends for its validity upon the meaning of the word *ἀδελφός*, which is not the case. The argument is not that Timothy was no Apostle, because Paul calls him a brother, but because Paul does not call him an Apostle, when he calls himself one. The case would have been substantially the same, if any other title had been given to Timothy, or none at all. If, for example, he had said, "Paul an Apostle of Jesus Christ, and Timothy," the inference would still have been that Timothy was no Apostle, not because Paul describes him as being something else, but because he does not describe him as being an apostle, in the very circumstances where such a description, if consistent with the fact, would seem to be unavoidable. It matters not, then, how vague or indecisive the term *brother* may be, in itself considered, or when separately used. If Paul had merely called Timothy "a brother," the term would have had no distinctive meaning; but when put in opposition to "apostle," it becomes distinctive, as in Acts xv. 1, where "apostles, presbyters, and brethren" are enumerated. Are not three distinct classes here intended? Yet "the apostles were brethren to each other, the elders were brethren of the apostles, so were the laity." But the vague term *brethren*, when connected with the specific titles *apostles* and *elders*, itself acquires a specific meaning. That this is the case in Acts xv. 1, we

are happy to prove by the same high authority which denies it in the case before us. "These two classes of ministers are distinguished from each other in the passage which speaks of them as *"apostles and elders,"* or which enumerate *"apostles and elders and brethren,"* or the laity. If *"priests and levites,"* if *"bishops and deacons,"* are allowed to be distinct orders, if *"apostles and brethren"* are also allowed to be distinct orders, then on the same principle that the conjunction is not exegetical, *"apostles and elders"* may fairly be accounted distinct orders likewise. And as in the expression *"apostles and elders and brethren"* severalty is unquestionably implied between the latter of these three classes and the others, it must as clearly be implied between the former two. Apostles were therefore one class, and elders another class, just as the laity were a third class.\*" Now there seems to be no reason why the principle thus clearly and correctly stated in relation to the plural forms *"apostles and brethren,"* should not apply to the singular forms *"apostle and brother."* If it be said that in the latter case, ἀδελφίς is not the specific designation of a class, as ἀδελφοί is in the other, we reply that ἀδελφοί owes its specific meaning to its combination with two other terms of office. This may be rendered clear by supposing that certain persons had been mentioned in Acts xv. as οἱ ἀδελφοί simply, without the use of any other title. The term would then be perfectly indefinite and we should be left to gather from the context or to guess whether it signified apostles, or apostles and elders, or the whole body of believers. But when employed in combination with the other terms, it necessarily acquires a distinct sense analogous to them. Why then is not the same effect produced upon the meaning of the singular ἀδελφίς by its combination with the singular ἀπόστολος? It is not disputed that the latter is as much a name of office as ἀπόστολοι in Acts xv. There is no reason therefore for supposing that ἀδελφίς is not as distinctive in its meaning as ἀδελφοί. The perfect analogy between the cases will be clear if we advert to the grammatical principle on which the general expression *brethren*, as used in Acts xv., acquires a specific meaning. Since the name, in itself, was applicable to the apostles and presbyters as well as the lay-brethren, it would

\* Episcopacy Examined and Re-examined, pp. 14, 15.

embrace them all unless its meaning had been limited by the express mention of two classes comprehended under the generic term. That is to say, the name ἀδελφοί comprehends apostles, presbyters, and private Christians, and when used alone might be naturally understood to signify them all. But when either of those classes is expressly mentioned by its proper title, the general term, if still used, must of course be used to signify the rest. Thus "Apostles and elders and brethren" means "Apostles and elders (who are not Apostles), and brethren (who are neither Apostles nor elders)." So too "an Apostle and a brother" means "an Apostle and a brother (who is not an Apostle)." Or if it does not, some reason should be given for the use of an expression which seems just as distinctive as the one in Acts xv. We have said, however, that the strength of the argument does not depend upon the meaning of ἀδελφός, and that even if that word had been omitted, the natural inference would still have been that Timothy was no Apostle. This admits of illustration from analogy. When Cicero and Antony were consuls, it is scarcely conceivable that a joint official letter from them could have been inscribed as follows: "M. T. Cicero consul et M. Antonius civis Romanus." Such an inscription would have been universally regarded as presumptive evidence that the Antony thus mentioned was not at the time consul; a presumption capable of being removed, but only by positive proof of the most conclusive kind, including the assignment of some reason for the obvious distinction drawn between the colleagues. But why should such proof be required? The terms of the inscription would be absolutely true, even if Antony was consul; for both he and his colleague were Roman citizens, and there is nothing inconsistent with the fact in giving Cicero a specific name and Antony a generic one. All this is true and yet it would be wholly inconclusive for this reason, that the inference, as to Antony's not being consul, was not founded on the truth or falsehood of the title *civis*, nor on its general or specific sense, but on the unaccountable distinction drawn between him and his colleague, by the marked application of the official title to one of them exclusively. This view of the matter serves to show the fallacy involved in the assertion that "Paul's calling Timothy a brother, while he calls himself an Apostle, proves no more that Timothy was not an

Apostle than it does that he was not a clergyman at all, but only a layman." The inference that Timothy was no Apostle is deduced from the distinction so expressly made between him and Paul as an Apostle. There is no such distinction made between him and Paul as a clergyman or minister, and therefore there is no ground for the inference that Timothy was "only a layman." An argument founded on the express mention of a certain office, however little it may prove as to that office, cannot prove as much, because it can prove nothing, as to an office which is not mentioned at all. If we read, in a Presbyterian publication, of "A. B. the pastor and C. D. a member of the church," although we know that according to our constitution, pastors are always elders, and elders are always members of the church, we should certainly infer, with absolute certainty, that C. D. was not a collegiate pastor with A. B., nor would our confidence in this conclusion be at all impaired by being told, that the writer's calling C. D. a church-member no more proved that he was not a pastor than it proved that he was not an elder. If again we read, in an Episcopal journal, of "Bishop Potter and Dr. Dorr," we should certainly regard the very form of the expression as sufficient to evince that Dr. Dorr was not Assistant Bishop of Pennsylvania, even in spite of the assurance that the terms used no more prove that Dr. D. is not a bishop, than they prove that he is not a presbyter, because bishops, presbyters, deacons, and even laymen, may be doctors. In both these cases, as in that which they are used to illustrate, every reader feels that, if the higher title belonged equally to both the persons mentioned, its being applied to one, and not the other, would be an anomaly requiring explanation, in default of which the inference seems unavoidable, that the application was designed to be exclusive; or, in other words, that when Paul, in two epistles, calls himself "an Apostle" and Timothy a "brother," he excludes the latter from the rank of an Apostle.

In the epistle to the Philippians (ii. 19) we find Paul proposing to send Timothy to them, and describing him as one "like-minded," who would "naturally care for their state," "who had served with Paul in the gospel, as a son with a father." These expressions are not only reconcilable with the supposition, that Timothy, although a presbyter, was Paul's inferior and under his direction, but agree far better with that supposition than



with the supposition that he was Paul's equal, a "supreme" Apostle. In the epistles to the Thessalonians, Silas and Timothy are joined with Paul in the inscriptions. It has never been contended that this of itself implies equality of rank ; and that it does not, is sufficiently apparent from 1 Thess. iii. 2, where Paul again appears directing Timothy's movements, and where Timothy is described as a brother, a minister of God, a fellow-labourer in the gospel of Christ, but not as an Apostle. And yet here, if anywhere, the introduction of that title would have been not only natural, but almost unavoidable, if Timothy had been entitled to it.

These are all the cases in which Timothy is mentioned, except in the epistles addressed to himself, and from a view of the whole it would appear, (1) that in the history he is mentioned only as a personal attendant upon Paul ; (2) that in the epistles, he appears as a minister of God, a preacher of Christ, a fellow-labourer of Paul in the gospel, all which expressions are applicable to him as a presbyter, and cannot therefore furnish any proof that he was an Apostle ; (3) that this agrees perfectly with the fact, that he is never expressly called an Apostle, even when he is particularly mentioned and described, and when the omission of the title could not fail, on any ordinary principle of interpretation, to distinguish him from Paul who is described as an Apostle ; (4) that while he is no where represented as performing apostolic acts, he is repeatedly described as being subject to Paul's orders and directions, a fact which harmonizes perfectly with the supposition of his official inferiority, and can only be reconciled with any other by means of forced constructions and gratuitous assumptions. This view of Timothy's official character, as it appears in the other epistles and the Acts of the Apostles, will prepare us for the consideration of the two epistles to himself, and for the question whether these epistles contain proof of his apostleship so clear as to invalidate the strong presumption, that he was officially inferior to Paul.

In the title or inscription of the first epistle, Paul addresses Timothy as "his own son in the faith," and in that of the second as "his dearly beloved son." These epithets prove nothing, as to official rank or power, and are only remarkable as additional instances of the consistent uniformity with which the name Apostle is withheld from Timothy, whether in speaking to or of him.

From 1 Tim. i. 3, it appears that, when Paul went into Macedonia, he left Timothy in Ephesus, that he might "charge some" to "teach no other doctrines, neither give heed to fables," &c. This *charge* he is again said, in v. 18, to have committed to Timothy, according to the prophecies which went before upon him. The phrase "this charge" must refer either to the "ministry" which Paul himself had received, according to v. 12, or to the charge mentioned in v. 3. If it means the former, the word *διακονία* being applicable to all ranks, proves nothing as to Timothy's apostleship. But that it means the latter appears more probable, (1) from the parenthetical character of the whole intervening passage, vs. 5-17, (2) from the verbal correspondence between *παραγγείλης* v. 3. and *παραγγελία* vs. 5, 18.

The second chapter contains directions with respect to public prayer, its subjects (vs. 1-7), the persons permitted to perform it (v. 8), and the duty of women with respect to public worship (vs. 9-15). No personal agency is expressly ascribed to Timothy, but it is evidently implied that he was to enforce these regulations, and of course that he was clothed with power so to do.

The third chapter contains the qualifications of bishops and deacons. Here again no personal agency is ascribed to Timothy. It is said, indeed, in v. 14, "these things write I unto thee, hoping to come to thee shortly; but if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church," &c. This might possibly refer to Timothy's own conduct in one of the two offices which had just been described, or in both, for the greater includes the less. But when taken in connexion with the "charge" mentioned in ch. i. 3, 18, it seems to imply that these directions are given to him, because he would be called upon to ordain others, and that he might know what qualifications to require.

In the fourth chapter, after enumerating certain heretical and fanatical errors which were to be looked for, Paul says to Timothy, (v. 6) "if thou put the brethren in remembrance of these things, thou shalt be a good minister of Jesus Christ," &c. The "brethren," whom Timothy was thus to "put in mind," may have been either brethren in the ministry, or laymen, or the whole Christian brotherhood, including both. In relation to these and some other matters, the Apostle adds, "these things

command and teach," (v. 11). He then commands him to avoid contempt, by setting an example of consistent conduct, purity, &c., adding "till I come, give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine," (v. 13). This implies that when Paul did come, he would give him more particular directions for his subsequent conduct, a suggestion which by no means favours, though it may not directly impugn, the hypothesis of Timothy's apostleship. The important passage, 1 Tim. iv. 14, having been examined at length in a former article, is here omitted.

In ch. iv. 15, Paul exhorts Timothy to meditate on these instructions, and to give himself wholly to his work, that his improvement (*προκοπή*) might appear to all. This, to say the least, is more in accordance with the supposition, that the person thus addressed was a young preacher, of the common rank, who had a character to form and influence to gain, than that he was a "supreme apostle," the official equal of the person writing. In the next verse (ch. iv. 16) Paul exhorts him to take heed to himself, (i. e., his personal deportment and hopes), and to his doctrine (what he preached), and to continue in them, because in so doing he would both save himself and those who heard him. Timothy here appears in the character of a preacher, without any allusion to higher powers than might have belonged to an ordinary presbyter.

In ch. v. 1, he is told not to rebuke an elder, but entreat him as a father. Even if *πρεσβύτερος* had here its technical meaning, as a name of office, the passage would prove nothing as to Timothy's official rank, because upon the supposition that he was a presbyter, nothing could be more natural than the exhortation not to rebuke a brother presbyter, but to entreat him. But that *πρεσβύτερος* is here used in its primary and proper sense, viz. an old man, is apparent from the whole drift of the passage, and especially from the antithetical relation which *πρεσβύτερος* sustains to *νεώτερος* in v. 1, and *πρεσβύτερος* in v. 2. In v. 7 he is commanded to give these things in charge (*παραγγελλε*), which implies that he was vested with authority to reprove and exhort both old and young, and to regulate the conduct of the church towards widows as the object of their charity. The same may be said of v. 11 and the intervening verses, and indeed of the whole passage ending v. 15.

1 Tim. v. 17 has been a subject of much controversy, as to the questions whether *πρεσβύτεροι* means *old men* in the popular, or *elders* in the official sense; and whether a distinction is here recognised between the two classes of teaching and ruling elders. The discussion of these questions would be foreign from our present purpose. Whether ruling elders, as distinct from preachers of the gospel, are here spoken of or not, it is admitted upon all hands that the text relates to presbyters or elders in the highest sense, and it will therefore be sufficient for our present purpose, to assume that they alone are mentioned. It appears, then, that Timothy is here directed, at least by implication, to treat certain presbyters with particular respect. This does not necessarily imply that he was their superior; for the very same exhortation might have been addressed to the people, who seem indeed to be included in the exhortation, as the indefinite passive form (*ἀξιούσθωσαν*) is used, instead of a direct address to Timothy. If Paul, in writing to the whole church, might have said, "Let the presbyters who rule well be counted worthy of double honour," without implying that the presbyters were subject to the body of the brethren, his use of the same form of speech to Timothy cannot possibly prove that they were subject to him. But one thing it does prove, of a very different nature, viz. that Presbyters were *rulers* in the church, and not mere agents of "apostle-bishops." It may be said, that *προσέτινες* merely means presiding or holding the first place. This is a question to be settled by usage. In Rom. xii. 8, ὁ προϊστάμενος cannot denote mere rank or conspicuous position, for two reasons; (1) because a man could not be exhorted to hold such a position with diligence; and (2) because all the other terms connected with it denote specific actions. The same thing is evident from the collocation of *προϊστάμενους* in 1 Thess. v. 12, between *κοπιῶντας* and *νουθετοῦντας*, both denoting specific functions of the ministry. In 1 Tim. iii. 4, the bishop is described as one that ruleth well (*καλῶς προϊστάμενον*) his own house, which can hardly mean one who holds the first place in it, without any original jurisdiction over it. The same remark applies to v. 12, where the deacons are described as ruling (*προϊστάμενοι*) their children and their households well. Let the same sense which *προΐσθμι* evidently has in these four cases, be applied to that before us, and it becomes plain that presbyters are spoken



of as ruling just as really as bishops and deacons are said to rule their own families. That the rule referred to is that of the church, appears from what follows in the same verse as to labouring in word and doctrine. Here then is an explicit mention of presbyters as rulers in the church, without any reference to a superior human power. Where shall we find an equally distinct ascription of the ruling power to Apostles, not of the original thirteen? If here, as in the case of *πρεσβύτεριον*, it should be said, that *πρεσβύτερος* means Apostles, then, besides that the assumption is entirely gratuitous, Timothy, according to the adverse doctrine, was a hyper-apostolical church-officer, not only equal but superior to Paul, who was a mere Apostle.

"Against an elder receive not an accusation but before two or three witnesses," i. e. upon their testimony, (1 Tim. v. 19). If *πρεσβύτερος* here means a ruling elder, as distinguished from a preacher, this is nothing more than a direction to a pastor with respect to charges brought against his assessors. But granting that presbyter is here to be taken in its highest sense, what does this verse prove, as to Timothy's relative position, with respect to these presbyters? Simply this, that he was empowered to "receive an accusation" against them. There is nothing said of punishing, condemning, nor even of trying them. The only act mentioned is that of receiving an accusation against them. For anything that appears, the reference might be merely to accusations of a private kind, which Timothy is cautioned not to "receive" without satisfactory proof. But even granting that the reference is clearly to judicial process; it will only prove that Timothy had power to judge presbyters. From this the adverse party argues that, in judging presbyters, he held an office superior to theirs. Let us grant, for a moment, that he did; this superior office may have been a temporary one. The most that can with reason be inferred is that a presbyter was sometimes clothed with extraordinary powers to try other presbyters. Nor is there anything unnatural or contrary to analogy in this hypothesis. The favourite privilege of modern freemen is to be tried by their peers. If an Apostle, or "Apostle-bishop," were accused, by whom would he be tried? By one or more of the same order. Would it follow from this that the judges, in that case, were superior to the accused, in permanent official rank? There is no distinction

between the cases arising from the fact of Timothy alone being referred to. Admitting that the fact is so, although it may be customary and, on the whole, desirable, to appoint a plurality of judges in such cases, there is nothing absurd in the appointment of a single one. Some writers on jurisprudence have contended for such a constitution of all courts as the most safe and reasonable. We do not assert that Timothy was clothed with this extraordinary power. We only assert that this is quite as fair an inference from the proposed interpretation of the verse before us, as the inference that Timothy must have had a permanent office above that of presbyter, because he acted as the sole judge of presbyters.

But what proof is there, that he was to be the sole judge? We have hitherto conceded it, in order to evince, that even in that case, nothing could be proved as to his holding a superior rank. But the concession was entirely gratuitous. It rests on nothing but the fact that Paul's instructions are addressed to Timothy in the second person singular, "Receive not THOU an accusation." "Let us see what would follow from the rigid application of this rule. If the singular form of the command in question proves that Timothy alone was to receive accusations against Presbyters, then the similar form, used in other parts of the epistle, proves that he alone was to "war a good warfare, holding faith and a good conscience, (ch. i. 18, 19); that he alone was to refuse profane and old wives' fables, and exercise himself rather unto godliness (ch. iv. 7); that he alone was to command and teach these things," (ch. iv. i.); that he alone was to be an example of the believers in word, in conversation, in charity, (ch. iv. 12); that he alone was to give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine (ib. v. 13); that he alone was to meditate upon these things and give himself wholly to them (ib. v. 15); that he alone was to take heed unto himself and to his doctrine, and to continue in them (v. 16); that he alone had hearers, whose salvation or perdition was at stake (ib.) Is it valid reasoning to infer from these commands, that Timothy was the only preacher in Ephesus? If so, where were his presbyters? If not, why should the personal address, in ch. viii. 19, prove anything more, as to the limitation of the powers and duties there referred to, than it does in all the other cases above cited? If it be asked, who else could be included in the

exhortation, the answer is, they who held the same office, or the Presbyters mentioned in the context. It is not necessary for our present purpose, to allege that this must be the meaning. It is sufficient to maintain that it may be, and that consequently there can be no just ground for assuming, that the official acts, ascribed to Timothy, were exclusive acts.

If it be asked, why he is individually addressed, and not as one of a number, it is a sufficient answer, that Paul was writing to him alone, and that the acts to be performed were individual acts, whether performed in connexion with others, or not. If an English Bishop should address a letter to an American one, advising him as to the performance of his duties, might he not naturally say to him, "I hope my brother will be careful, both as to the persons whom he admits to the episcopal office, and as to the reception of charges against them, when they are admitted?" Would it be fair to infer from this, that the person addressed had the sole right of consecrating bishops and of trying them? Would not the inference be at least as fair, that what was said to him individually, had respect to functions, which could only be performed in conjunction with others? And if so, may we not infer the same thing, in the case of Timothy? The bare possibility of such an inference makes it at least unnecessary to infer, that because Timothy is individually addressed, he alone was competent to do the acts commanded. We have no doubt that multitudes of letters have been written to young Presbyterian ministers, in which precisely the same form of address was used, in reference to acts which, according to our constitution, no presbyter can ordinarily perform alone. If then Timothy is not here mentioned as the sole judge of accused presbyters, nothing can be inferred as to his superiority. If, on the other hand, he is so mentioned, it is more natural to infer, that he was clothed with an extraordinary judicial power, than that he held an office which he is nowhere said to have held, by the name of which he is nowhere called, and the very existence of which, as a part of the permanent church-system, is a matter of dispute.

The fallacy of the adverse reasoning may be made apparent by an illustration. Suppose a letter should be found hereafter, addressed to an officer in our navy, and advising him as to his conduct, with respect to certain accusations brought against a

captain in the same service, the address throughout being singular in its form, and without any intimation of its being applicable to any other person. Suppose this passage to occur in the letter, "I would advise you never to receive a charge against a captain without ample proof." A writer on naval history infers from these expressions, (1) that they relate to judicial process, (2) that the person addressed had the sole right of trying the accused, (3) that he must therefore have been superior in rank to a post-captain. Subsequent inquiry shows, perhaps, that the language of the letter related merely to private accusation; or if not, that the person addressed was one of a Court Martial, and in rank precisely equal to the accused party. Are not the supposed words perfectly consistent with this state of the case? If so, what follows, as to the nature of the reasoning, which led to the false conclusion? That it proves nothing, because it proves too much. If, now, this reasoning had been used to prove that the rank of Admiral existed in the United States navy in 1849 (the supposed date of the letter), would it not very much resemble that which is used to prove that Apostles (not of the original thirteen) existed in the primitive church? That argument, so far as it is founded on this passage, takes for granted (1) that the words relate to judicial process against presbyters; (2) that Timothy is represented as the sole judge; (3) that he could not be so, unless superior to presbyters in permanent official rank. Waving the first point, or admitting its correctness, we allege, in opposition to the second, that he need not be supposed to have been the sole judge; and to the third, that his judging presbyters, whether alone or not, is no proof that he was more than a presbyter himself. Indeed, supposing presbyters, as we do, to have been the highest permanent officers in the church, it was only by presbyters that they could be tried, just as in the Protestant Episcopal Church bishops must be tried by bishops, and in the army generals by generals. Whether Timothy tried presbyters by virtue of extraordinary powers, or in the discharge of his ordinary duties as a member of a presbytery, matters not. Either of these suppositions sufficiently accounts for the expressions in the text, and thereby precludes the necessity of assuming a permanent superiority of rank. He is elsewhere described as a presbyter; he is nowhere described as an Apostle;



what he is here described as doing he was competent to do as a presbyter; it is therefore unreasonable to infer, that he was an Apostle.

The same remarks apply to ch. v. 22: "Lay hands suddenly on no man, neither be partaker of other men's sins." It may even be questioned, whether this relates at all to ordination. Why may it not refer to the gift of the Holy Spirit? If such a reference is even supposable in ch. iv. 14, it is highly probable in this place, where nothing is mentioned but the bare imposition of hands. But granting that it does refer to ordination, it is not said to what office; and why may it not have been to that of deacon? But even granting that it refers to the ordination of presbyters, it does not follow, for the reasons above given, that Timothy alone was to lay on hands. And if he did it alone, he may have done so merely as a presbyter, or by virtue of an extraordinary but temporary power. A solitary Presbyterian minister, in a heathen land or elsewhere, might ordain others, in perfect consistency with Presbyterian principles. Whether Timothy was clothed with extraordinary powers, for a particular occasion, matters not. If he was the only Presbyter in Ephesus, the necessity of the case would authorize him to ordain. The requisition of a plurality is not to be found in scripture. The principle involved in ordination is that it can only be performed by one who has himself been ordained. And this requisition is as really complied with by the act of one ordainer as by that of twenty. For obvious reasons of expediency, the exercise of the power may be limited, in ordinary cases, to a plurality of persons; but the restriction rests upon no principle. If one bishop in the Protestant Episcopal Church can admit others to an order inferior to his own, there is no reason, except usage and arbitrary regulation, why he should not, if necessary, admit one to the same office which he holds himself. Even supposing, then, that Timothy ordained alone, it does not follow that he was superior in rank to presbyters. The Apostle's exhortation would be perfectly appropriate, if addressed to one of a body of presbyters. And we know from Acts xx. 17, that there were other Presbyters in or about Ephesus. The assumption, then, that Timothy held an office superior to that of presbyters, is wholly unsupported by the text before us.

In 1 Tim. vi. 2, Timothy is commanded to teach and exhort servants as to their relative duties. In the next verse, Paul denounces any who should teach otherwise, implying that there were others authorized to teach. This passage, then, relates to powers which Timothy possessed in common with others. From such false teachers he is commanded to withdraw himself. This could hardly be addressed to an ecclesiastical superior, who possessed the sole right of exercising discipline. It applies much better to one among a number of authorized teachers, whose defence against them was to shun their company. In v. 11, the Apostle exhorts Timothy to avoid the sin of covetousness, and to cultivate the Christian graces, to fight the good fight of faith, and to lay hold of eternal life. He speaks of him, at the same time, as having "professed a good profession." This commandment he charges him to keep "without spot, unrebukable, until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ." (vs. 13, 14). This refers evidently to the immediately preceding exhortation, as to the seeking of salvation, and the cultivation of the Christian graces. It cannot, therefore, be used as an argument to prove that Timothy had not a temporary commission of an extraordinary kind. In vs. 17-19 Paul tells him what exhortations he should give to rich men. In v. 20 he charges him to be faithful to his trust, and on his guard against a spurious philosophy. All these advices are perfectly appropriate, if addressed to a mere presbyter or ordinary minister.

The second epistle is addressed by "Paul an Apostle of Jesus Christ," to Timothy, not as a brother-apostle, but as a "dearly beloved son." Such an address would certainly not have been unnatural, even to an official equal, much inferior in age. But it cannot be denied that the continual omission of the apostolical title, in the very places where we might expect it, is somewhat unfavourable to the truth of the position, that Timothy was a "supreme Apostle." In the sixth verse, Paul says: "Wherefore I put thee in remembrance, that thou stir up the gift of God, which is in thee, by the putting on of my hands." This relates either to the gift of the Holy Ghost or to ordination. If the former, it proves nothing as to Timothy's official rank. since mere disciples not only received but conferred the Holy Ghost, as appears from the case of Ananias, Acts ix. 10, 17. If

it relates to ordination, it must have been either to the deaconship, the eldership, or the apostleship. The first has never been alleged. If it was to the eldership, the same transaction is referred to as in 1 Tim. iv. 14, from which, as we have seen, it may be proved that presbyters ordained. Or even granting that the ordination was performed by an Apostle, if it was to the office of a presbyter, Paul's twice exhorting him to stir up the gift conferred upon him in his ordination to the eldership, strongly implies that he was nothing more, and indeed that this was the highest permanent office in the church. If, on the other hand, the ordination spoken of is to the office of Apostle, then it follows that Timothy received this ordination in the interval between the two epistles, and, consequently, that the powers ascribed to him in the first epistle (including those of discipline and ordination) belonged to him as a presbyter. The same remarks apply to v. 14, "that good thing, which was committed unto thee, keep by the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in us." In v. 13, Timothy is exhorted to hold fast "the form of sound words" which he had heard from Paul, who still addresses him as his pupil and inferior, without the least allusion to his being a colleague and "supreme Apostle."

Ch. ii. 12. "Thou therefore, my son, be strong in the grace that is in Christ Jesus; and the things that thou hast heard of me, among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men who shall be able to teach others also." Timothy is here directed to ordain teachers. From this it is inferred that he held an office superior to that of Presbyter. But this assumes (1) that he was to ordain alone, (2) that a person cannot be admitted to a given rank, except by one who holds a higher rank. The first, as we have seen, is a gratuitous assumption. The second would render it impossible to perpetuate the highest order. If an Apostle could ordain Apostles, it is not to be assumed as an impossibility that a Presbyter should ordain Presbyters. How can it be argued that, because Timothy ordained Presbyters, he must have been more than a Presbyter himself, any more than that because Paul (according to the adverse theory) ordained Apostles, he must have been something more than an Apostle? If the latter conclusion does not follow of course, neither does the former. If an Apostle could ordain Apostles, the natural presumption (in the absence of all proof to the con-

trary) is that Presbyters could ordain Presbyters. This would be a natural presumption, even if the perpetuity of the apostolic office could be proved. How much more when the antecedent probabilities are all against it, and when this very text is relied upon, as one of the few passages which prove it. The question is whether peculiar apostolic powers are ascribed to Timothy. The proof of the affirmative is, that he ordained Presbyters. The very same fact we adduce as proof that Presbyters ordained. If we have no right to assume that he acted as a presbyter, still less right have our opponents to assume that none except apostles ordained. We know that Timothy was a presbyter, but we do not know that he was an Apostle. It is, therefore, more allowable to assume that Timothy ordained as a presbyter, which we know him to have been, than that he ordained as an Apostle, which we do not know him to have been.

In this same chapter Paul exhorts Timothy to endure hardness, (v. 3) to consider what he heard or read, (v. 7), to put the people in remembrance of these things, charging them before the Lord that they strive not about words to no profit, (v. 14.) "Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth, but shun profane and vain babbling, for they will increase unto more ungodliness," vs. 15, 16. How much more natural and appropriate are these advices, if addressed to a mere Presbyter than if addressed to a "Supreme Apostle," and how strange is it that among these exhortations, having reference to the duties of a Presbyter, not one should have crept in, relating to any peculiar apostolic function. How strange that Paul should have nothing to say to his brother-Apostle about apostolic powers and duties, while he exhorts him to "flee youthful lusts," (v. 22), to "follow righteousness, faith, charity, peace," &c., (v. 22), to "avoid foolish, and unlearned questions," (v. 23.) Instead of telling him what a Supreme Apostle ought to be, he tells him that "the servant of the Lord must not strive, but be gentle, apt to teach, &c., (v. 24.) It may be said, indeed, that many of these advices have respect to common Christian duties, and that it might as well be argued that Timothy was a private Christian, as that he was a mere Presbyter. And so it might, if there were not mingled with these exhortations to common duties, some which clearly and confessedly relate to those of Presbyters. But as there are none



which indubitably recognise Timothy as an Apostle, the cases are not parallel. In ch. iii. 14, after describing the false teachers and seducers, who were to be looked for, Paul exhorts Timothy, not as might have been expected on the opposite hypothesis, to interpose his apostolical authority, but to continue in the thing which he had learned, knowing of whom he had received them. And on what ground does he exhort him so to do? Not because he was an Apostle, but because he had fully known Paul's doctrine, manner of life, &c., (vs. 10, 11), and because he had himself from a child known the holy scriptures, (v. 15), which were able to make him wise unto salvation, and which were given that the man of God might be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works, (v. 17.) Here again the most tempting opportunities of mentioning Timothy's apostolic rank, and insisting on his apostolic duties, are neglected. This is still more strikingly the case in the last chapter, where, in view of his own approaching death, the apostle exhorts Timothy to a faithful and diligent discharge of duty. Here, if anywhere, something might be looked for which should set at rest the question of Timothy's official superiority to the presbyters at Ephesus. But what are the exhortations given him? To preach the word, to reprove, rebuke, and exhort, to be watchful, to endure afflictions, and to do the work of an **EVANGELIST**.

This last word has been taken in a twofold sense. Some suppose it to denote a presbyter clothed with extraordinary powers, for a limited time and a specific purpose. Others understand by it a *preacher* indefinitely, without any reference to his official rank. The former supposition, though perhaps incapable of demonstration, is far more probable, and in better keeping with the tenor of the New Testament, than the supposition that Timothy was an Apostle. If adopted, it explains completely why he was commissioned to ordain alone (as alleged by our opponents), and to discipline presbyters. But let it be granted that the word means nothing more than *preacher of the gospel*; it only furnishes another instance of the extraordinary fact, that every title and description, which could be applied to Timothy, seems to have come into the mind of Paul more readily than that of Apostle, which he seems indeed to have strangely forgotten, not only as respects the word, but the thing which it denotes. However then we may explain the word *evangelist*,

it favours our conclusion. If it means nothing more than a *preacher*, it indirectly strengthens our presumption that Timothy was no Apostle. If it means an extraordinary temporary officer, it precludes the necessity of supposing that he was more than a presbyter, even on the supposition that he exercised more than presbyterial powers.

In ch. iv. 9, Paul commands Timothy to come to him, as soon as possible, and in v. 21 he fixes the time, before which he wishes him to come. The reason which he gives is, that Demas, Crescens, Tychicus, and Titus had left him. Luke was the only companion or *ὑπηρέτης* who still continued with him. Does not this imply that Timothy was wanted to supply their place? This is rendered still more probable by the direction which is added, (v. 11), "Take Mark and bring him with thee, for he is profitable to me *εἰς διακονίαν*," i. e. as a *διάκονος*, in which capacity both Mark and Timothy had travelled with Paul before, as we have seen. With this, too, agrees the subsequent direction, as to the cloak and parchments, from which of course, nothing can be proved, as to Timothy's official rank, but which, by a vast majority of readers, must be seen to agree better with the supposition of his inferiority than with that of his equality. And thus at the close of Paul's last epistle to Timothy, we find the latter acting in the same capacity as when he first appeared in history, viz. that of a personal attendant upon Paul, and subject to his orders. He is here re-called as one who had been absent on a temporary service. This serves to corroborate the conclusion that, if Timothy did exercise powers above those of presbyters, it was by virtue of a special commission.

Having now shown that the case of Timothy presents no exception to the general statement from which we set out, we shall reserve the case of Titus for a future opportunity.

ART. V.—*The Life of Ashbel Green, V. D. M., begun to be written by himself in his eighty-second year, and continued till his eighty-fourth; prepared for the press, at the Author's request, by Joseph H. Jones, Pastor of the Sixth Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia.* New York. Robert Carter and Brothers. 8vo. 1849. pp. 628.

There has been a long expectation of this work; for before the death of the Reverend Dr. Green, it was understood among his pupils and admirers, that he was preparing to leave an autobiography. Indeed this venerable man so far survived almost all the friends of his prime, that if his life was to be written at all, it seemed necessary that it should be written by himself. This has actually been accomplished, and we have the result before us, to an extent for which we were scarcely prepared.

The life of Dr. Green connects itself most remarkably with the history of our church, comprising as it does the two remarkable epochs of the organization under the first General Assembly, and the secession of the New School party in 1837. Still more real and important was Dr. Green's connexion with our whole internal polity, the establishment of our missions, and the founding of our Theological Seminary. There is scarcely an important event in the history of our General Assembly, with which this excellent man was not in some way connected, and it would be difficult to name any one of whom it can be said that he was more devotedly attached to Presbyterian Institutions. The volume now published will therefore be peculiarly interesting to the members of this church; but it likewise presents points of attraction to other classes of readers. Dr. Green, in common with the whole Presbyterian body throughout our territory, was a staunch American Whig: as such he was intimately related to the very highest class of patriotic statesmen, admitted to the counsels of leading minds in church and state, bred in the most ardent temper of revolutionary times, and closely observant of those events which form the materials of our constitutional history; and of all these particulars he has made accurate and often minute record, with that honesty and candour which were his characteristics. He was not less prominent, in a high literary position, as president of a great and venerable college,

the alumni of which, during a very long period, are familiar with his name and services. Then, in the autumn of his fruitful life, he came reluctantly but boldly into an ecclesiastical conflict, which was severe and critical; in regard to which he was grievously misrepresented; but through which he passed, if not without obloquy, yet exempt from every charge of duplicity or malice. It may be added, that at a time when our periodical literature was as yet immature, he devoted his talents to the diligent and laborious employment of the press, as an engine for defending evangelical truth. The summary, therefore, of such experiences could not fail to contain matter of enduring interest.

From the prefatory observations it appears that the editor is not responsible for the body of the work, which indeed is wholly from the pen of the autobiographer. The closing chapters however, at the request of the subject himself, are due to the Rev. Dr. Jones, and this editorial work has been accomplished with affection, respect, modesty, and judgment. Availing himself of the aid of several competent witnesses, all distinguished friends of Dr. Green, the editor has added the abundant results of his own near observation. The estimate of this venerated clergyman as here given is highly favourable, and yet guarded: it is happily expressed and condensed within reasonable bounds. In a word, we see nothing of editorial work, in which the numerous admirers of Dr. Green ought not to find gratification. As to style and even typography, the volume is attractive in a high degree.

In a record so extensive as this, and made in this manner, there will of course be many details which are far more valuable in the eyes of the writer and of intimate friends than they are to the public. This is remarkably exemplified in the volume before us. At the same time we have perused many parts of it with awakened feelings, and most parts of it with instruction and benefit. If Dr. Green kept an exceedingly minute diary of his smallest variations in corporeal and spiritual health, the lights and shadows of his daily picture, we regard his authority in the case as very weighty; and though our judgment differs in this particular, it also differs we know from the prevalent opinion of religious biographers. Justice requires us to add, that the work here published is not such a diary, but a newly



written memoir, from his own hand, founded on the more accurate memorandums of such a diary; in this it may be likened to the Confessions of Augustine. The book will be almost universally read by such of our readers as knew Dr. Green; for the sake of others we will offer some specimens of its character.

ASHBEL GREEN was the son of the Rev. Jacob Green, of Malden, in Massachusetts, but long settled in the ministry at Hanover, Morris county, New Jersey, and was born at Hanover, July, 6, 1762. To those of us who remember Dr. Green's bible-recitations in college, it is pleasing to remark the origin of this scheme in his mind; it was the recollection of his good father's family custom, namely the prescribing five chapters of the Bible to be examined on as a Sabbath-day's exercise. "The Rev. Robert Finley," says he, "who was afterwards settled at Baskenridge, was then [when Mr. Green was tutor in college] a member of the Freshman class; and he was the first clergyman except myself, that I ever heard of, as instituting a Bible class in his congregation. When I became the president of the college in 1812, all the students were formed into a Bible class, and I not long after heard of what I have stated in regard to Doctor Finley. Perhaps this valuable instruction of Bible classes may be traced into my father's family."

The early years of the American Revolution coincided with the boyhood of Dr. Green, and of this period his reminiscences are invaluable, containing original anecdotes never before committed to writing and important to the historian. Connected with these are lively sketches of the state of manners and arts in that day, which throw our present condition into high relief.

"Dr. Young, who lived to be an octogenarian, exclaimed—'At the age of fourscore, where is the world into which we were born?' referring to the death of coevals and the rising up of a new generation. But if this was proper and pithy in the capital of Britain, with how much greater propriety and emphasis may it be uttered by an inhabitant of the United States, at the age contemplated? Not only will he have survived the most of his contemporaries, and seen them succeeded by a new race, but the whole face of nature and of society will have been changed during his lifetime. I can remember the time when there were dense forests where there are now fertile fields; and when agriculture in the whole United States did not furnish an Irish potato which would now be thought tolerable. Cities and towns, within the scope of my recollection, have sprung into being, in number and beauty, and with a rapidity, of which the world does not

afford another example. Cincinnati, and all the other towns in what are now called the Western States, and, indeed the States themselves, had no existence in the days of my youth. I well remember that it was at college, about the twentieth year of my age, that I first heard of a fertile region of country, called Kentucky. You know, I suppose, that the capital of this State received its name in honour of the Lexington in Massachusetts, where British troops were first resisted by arms. Pittsburgh, at this time, was just coming into notice, and Baltimore was yet quite a small town. Philadelphia was scarcely a third as large as it now is. The extension of New York city has been still greater; and what is now called Western New York was then literally a howling wilderness. Boston has been greatly enlarged; and the towns of the eastern States generally, as well as those in the south, have, many of them, come into existence; and those which before had being, have been much beautified, and in every way received great improvements.

As to canals, steamboats, railroads and cars, every body knows that they are things of yesterday's production. Even turnpike roads did not exist in our country till long after a period to which I can look back. There was something that was called a turnpike road, although it little deserved the name, across Horse Neck, in the state of New York, in 1790. The first good turnpike was that between Philadelphia and Lancaster. A great clamour was raised against this by some of the German population of Pennsylvania; and several owners of farms opened their fields adjoining the turnpike gates, to let all who were so disposed pass without paying toll. Experience, however, soon not only reconciled the Germans and other opposers of the turnpike to this improvement, but made them its ardent friends, and prepared them to be advocates for other meliorations.

"Before our revolutionary war, there were no more than seven colleges, or institutions authorized to confer degrees in the arts, in the whole of British America. These were Harvard, in Massachusetts; Yale, in Connecticut; King's College, now Columbia, in New York; Nassau Hall, at Princeton; and Queen's College, now Rutgers, at Brunswick, in New Jersey; a college and charity school, since grown into the University of Pennsylvania, in Philadelphia; and William and Mary College, in Virginia. The number at present is six or seven-fold more numerous—far more so than is really advantageous to the cause of sound science. Academies and common schools have multiplied in like proportion, and are not obnoxious to the like censures.

I will just set down, as they occur to me, some of the most important scientific discoveries or improvements, which have been made during the period to which my memory extends. I thus notice, the planet Georgium Sidus, or Herschel; and the four smaller planets, Ceres, Pallas, Juno and Vesta, denominated asteroids, by Dr. Herschel, and several satellites of the larger planets; nearly the whole of what is called modern chemistry; the application of steam to the useful arts. The great power of steam had been long known, but its application (particularly after Watt's famous discovery

or invention,) to engines, mills and boats, and a variety of other purposes, is comparatively of recent date. To these I only add ballooning, vaccination, and the life-boat. This enumeration, I am well aware, is very far from being complete, and I with design omit all military improvements, or facilities for the destruction of human life."

A lively picture is given of the tumultuous and indignant patriotism which manifested itself in New Jersey during the war. Mr. Jacob Green was a member of the Provincial Congress of New Jersey, and the county in which he lived was beyond most exposed to alarms from the British. These causes led young Green to enter with great warmth into the service of his country, so that even in his fifteenth year, in the coldest December weather, he stood sentinel at a bridge over the Passaic, and indeed arrested a straggler who had not the countersign. We remember no memoirs which more strikingly set forth what the author calls the 'domestic military spirit' of our revolutionary times; while the events related in detail constitute a long but animating chapter in our national history, especially in regard to the state of New Jersey.

The religious education of Mr. Green did not prevent his being visited with infidel suggestions. Being greatly shaken, he entered on a course of reading, but the Scriptures themselves, as in many other instances, cleared away his doubts. In this period, between 1778 and 1782, occurs the following delightful record, which many a youth ought to read with a glow.

"It was not long before I was made to feel, that if the Bible contained revealed truth, my state and prospects were fearfully alarming. Such a seriousness as I had never known before, pervaded my mind: yet I still kept my feelings entirely to myself. I sought and found a place for retirement and devotion, in a copse of wood, on a piece of rising ground, a short distance from the house in which I resided. In this beautiful little grove was a large rock, precipitous on one of its sides, and from its base, and nearly in contact with it, had sprung up a young chestnut tree. On the bark of this tree, I cut with my penknife, in large letters, 'Holiness to the Lord,' that these solemn words might meet my eye whenever I came to the place of meditation and prayer. Being engaged at this time in teaching a numerous school, chiefly but not wholly of grammar scholars, my time was much occupied; but once a day at least, if not forbidden by the state of the weather, I paid a visit to my favourite grove, and spent some time sitting at the foot of the tree, in solemn meditation, concluded with a prayer, on my knees, or standing and leaning against the rock. Sweet and sacred spot! it is at this moment before my mind's eye, in all its loveliness. Some

ten or twelve years after I was an ordained minister, and journeying near the place, I made an attempt to find it, for its remembrance has ever been precious. But my attempt was not successful. I found with great regret, that the whole surface of the ground on which the grove had formerly existed, had entirely changed its aspect. The trees had all been cut down, and the field which contained them had been ploughed up for cultivation; and as there were several rocks in the field, I could not with certainty even identify the one that was so dear to my memory."

In 1781, after having been a teacher, young Green entered the Junior class in the college of New Jersey. He had intended to go to Yale, and was prevented by what might seem to be the most trifling occurrence. But he adds, "the whole of my subsequent life has taken its complexion and its course from the college with which I then became connected." The following statements will gratify graduates of New Jersey College, and perhaps induce them to procure the work. We have opportunity of knowing that no remembrances of a college life linger more affectionately in distant alumni, than those of the literary societies.

"In my last letter, I mentioned that the Cliosophic Society had repaired their hall in the college edifice, in which their meetings were held. The American Whig Society had not, at that time, resuscitated their institution, after the revolutionary war. Some account of its revival will form a part of a brief statement I shall give you of the origin and progress of both those rival societies, which must be unknown to you, as your college course was not passed at Nassau Hall. Before Dr. Witherspoon's accession to the presidentship of the college, the tradition in my time was, that two voluntary associations of the Students had existed, under the names of 'The Well Meaning' and 'Plain Dealing' societies; but that shortly after Dr. Witherspoon entered on his office, these societies changed their names or titles. The Well Meaning association took the name of Cliosophic, the Plain Dealing assumed the appellation of American Whig. At their origin, these societies had a sectional patronage. Those students who came from the eastern part of New Jersey, and from New York and New England, almost uniformly united with the former, and those from West Jersey, Pennsylvania, and the southern States, joined the latter. This sectional patronage was entirely done away by the revolutionary war. Since that period, both societies have included members from every part of the United States. My room-mate and myself were principally instrumental in reviving the Whig society. Very soon after our matriculation, I drew up a paper, pledging the subscribers to become members of this society, provided the original constitution could be obtained, and enough of the old members could be collected, and should be disposed to receive us to their fellowship. Both the constitution and the former minutes of the society had been care-



fully preserved by a graduate of the college, and were forthcoming at the request of the old members, when assembled for the purpose of admitting the pledged associates; and on inquiry, we found that a lady in the town had preserved some of the furniture of the old hall, which she was willing and desirous to return. The inventory was not long, and I will give it: a looking glass of considerable size, a pair of brass andirons, and two octavo volumes of Johnson's abbreviated dictionary, constituted the whole. The old members admitted nine of us as their associates, and the faculty of the college granted us the privilege of holding our meetings in the library-room of the college, till our hall should be repaired."

"The halls of these societies have had three locations; the first in the fourth story of Nassau Hall, in the two half rooms, which, with the entry between them, fill up, in that story, the front projection of the edifice. The second location was in the upper story of the present library, which they entirely occupied. Within a few years past, two large and handsome structures have been erected for their accommodation, at the south end of the back campus. The Clisophic Society occupy that on the west side of this campus, and the American Whig that on the east. Each of these societies now possesses a large, well selected, and very valuable library. The funds for the erection of the new structures were obtained by subscriptions from their graduate members, together with the contribution of those who were still in the classes of the college. The graduate members are, at present, very numerous. Among them are found the trustees and officers of the college, many of the most distinguished officers of the General and State governments, of the past as well as the present time, and a large number of literary and scientific individuals in private life—both societies confer diplomas on their members. At all times, the greatest secrecy has been enjoined on all who belong to these associations, in regard to their laws, usages and transactions—except that on public occasions they wear a badge, to indicate that the wearer is either a Whig or Clio. Between these literary corps, there has always existed an ardent spirit of rivalry, which, once before our revolutionary war, and once since, broke out into a paper war, which proceeded to such a length that the authority of the college was obliged to interfere and prohibit its continuance. Of late years, I believe the members of these societies form friendships with each other, and have more cordial intercourse generally, than was customary in former times; yet there is still a high spirit of competition, especially for what are called the honours of college. The influence of these societies, when they are rightly conducted, is, beyond a question, highly salutary. I used to think and say, that I derived as much benefit from the exercises of the Whig Society, while I was a member of college, as from the instructions of my teachers."

In the year 1783 Mr. Green received his bachelor's degree. The president of the College had recently been a distinguished member of Congress, and that body itself had been accommodated in Nassau Hall, and now adjourned to attend the Com-

mencement. They appeared on the stage therefore, in the old Princeton church, with the French and Dutch ambassadors, and the Commander in Chief. The valedictory oration had been assigned to young Green, and he concluded it with an address to General Washington. The General coloured as he was addressed. The next day as he was going to a Committee of Congress, Washington met the orator in one of the long passages of the College, stopped, and took him by the hand, and complimented him highly on his address, further sending his best wishes to the recently graduated class. General Washington made a donation of fifty guineas to the trustees, which they laid out in a full-length portrait of him, painted by the elder Peale; a work of art well remembered by all collegians, as predominating over the Junior benches in the old chapel; it contains the only portrait known to us of the lamented Mercer. Here it has long occupied the place, if not the very frame, of a preceding portrait of George the Second. This was decapitated by a cannon ball during the battle of Princeton. Passing from this to Mr. Green's licensure, we give another extract:

"My first public service after being licensed to preach was performed in the church at Princeton, then stately supplied by Dr. Witherspoon, who accompanied me to the pulpit. While under his direction, in my theological training, he had earnestly recommended his own mode of memoriter preaching; and, accordingly, my initial sermon was delivered without the appearance of notes; although I persisted, in opposition to his remonstrance, to place them under the Bible, from which I had read the chapter that contained my text. I had, however, no occasion to recur to them, for I had committed every sentence to memory, with as much accuracy as I ever did a grammar rule. After the worship was over, he tapped me on the shoulder, and said, 'Well, well, continue to do as well as that, and we'll be satisfied'—the only praise that he ever gave me to my face."

It is scarcely needful to ask attention to the history of our first General Assembly. The notices here given by Dr. Green though exceedingly useful are for that very reason not to be offered in abstract or abridgement. The incident respecting the "tolerating a false religion" is worthy of special note. Another passage on a subject now much misunderstood, admits of being extracted: it expresses a judgment to which we call the attention of our readers, a judgment moreover which we venture to predict will become that of the most advanced portions of our Presbyterian churches in dense districts. The experi-

ence of the Reformed Church, in its palmy days, as well as the general principles of presbytery, is in favour of collegiate charges.

“The difficulties attending collegiate pastoral charges have nearly, if not wholly, banished them from the Presbyterian Church. Why is this? There certainly are congregations in our connexion that cannot be adequately served by a single pastor. The primitive church, even in the apostolic age, appear to have had more than one pastor. Collegiate charges were common at the period of the Protestant reformation. They are still common in Scotland, and in the Dutch Church of Holland, and in this country. For myself I can truly say, of the three colleagues whom I had been connected, that I never had a difficulty with one of them. We lived together in uninterrupted brotherly affection and confidence. Let no pious minister consent to be the colleague of a man whose piety he thinks very questionable. But with one of whose personal religion he has no doubt, let him make an agreement, that each shall pray earnestly for the other in the daily prayers that he offers for himself, and that each shall defend his colleague’s character, as if it were his own, and there will be between such men very little danger of alienation. To this practice, under the blessing of God, and not to my own prudence or good nature, I attribute my happiness in the several collegiate charges that I have sustained.

“Dr. Sproat, my first colleague, was ‘an Israelite indeed in whom there was no guile.’ His common appellation in addressing me was, ‘My son,’ and if he had been a natural father I could scarcely have loved and honoured him more than I did. I visited him very frequently, and in all cases, when an honourable distinction in our pastoral charge was to be made, and in appearance it belonged to me, I not only offered it to him, as his due, being senior pastor, but I insisted on his taking it. He had three unmarried daughters, and my wife so gained their confidence, that if she had been their own sister, they could hardly have loved her more, or have respected her so much.

“My second colleague was the Rev. Dr. John N. Abeel. He had been my pupil both before he entered college, and during his whole academical course. It was therefore natural that I should love him, and that he should respect me, and this was verified in the whole course of our ministerial connexion, which indeed lasted only two or three years, when he accepted a call to the Dutch Church in New York. But a warm friendship continued between us till the day of his death.

“My last colleague was the Rev. Dr. Jacob J. Janeway. We were colleagues for thirteen years. It was with him, that I had an explicit understanding, that we should remember each other in our daily prayers, and treat each other’s character, as if it were our own. The consequences were most happy. We laboured and loved as brethren during the whole period of our collegiate connexion, and an untroubled and ardent attachment has existed between us to the present hour. I still pray for him daily in my private devotions.”

A commencement at Harvard, fifty-eight years ago, is very entertaining: and it is to be observed that there are no readers of this volume who will find more valuable pickings, in respect of dates, and biographical anecdotes, concerning the chief men in church and state, than our New England neighbors: among those mentioned are Dr. Styles, Dr. Dwight, Dr. Spring, Dr. Edwards, Dr. Dana, Mr. Bancroft, father of our late minister at London, Mr. Morse, father of the eminent Morses of New York, Samuel Adams, Mr. Belknap, the two Elliots, Mr. Eckley, and Dr. Hopkins.

“Set out in the morning with Mr. Eckley for commencement. The Governor invited us to breakfast with him, but we could not go. We took a chaise at Charlestown bridge, and rode on to Cambridge. The road was crowded with carriages, and men and women, and boys and children, all going to commencement. We arrived at the college, and by favour as a stranger, I walked in the procession with the overseers. The exercises were introduced with prayer by the president, who is awkward enough in the pulpit. In prayer he frequently hesitates, and sometimes recalls a word; yet on the whole he performs the duty in a judicious and sensible manner. The distortion of his features when he is speaking, is the worst thing about him to a person who is looking at him. We had two forensic disputations, and one syllogistic. The syllogistic was in Latin, and in my opinion, of little more use than to give a number of indifferent speakers the opportunity of saying something in a language not generally understood. The negator in repeating his position, called the word *corpōrum*, *corpōrum*, which the president corrected from the pulpit, and with which I was well pleased. The oration, disputations and dialogues, which were in English, were in general pretty well composed and tolerably spoken. The speaking however, was for the part far inferior to the composition, and below what I have seen elsewhere. The best oration was one on the French Revolution, spoken by a candidate for the master's degree. At three o'clock we adjourned for dinner, and on invitation, I dined in the dining hall with the corporation. This hall will accommodate two hundred persons, and each graduate at taking his degree, pays a certain sum, (I believe it is three dollars,) and in consequence is entitled to dine in the hall on commencement day, at the expense of the corporation, as long as he lives. The class who are candidates for degrees perform the office of waiting-men or servants at this dinner, and for this purpose they lay aside their college gowns and coats, and gird themselves with a towel, or throw it over one of their shoulders. It was not a little curious to me to see the orators of the day metamorphosed into servitors in a few minutes, and I could not prevail upon myself to call upon them to do any thing I wished. Yet I am not quite certain but that it is an useful custom, tending to teach the youth humility, and the important lesson that it is an honour as well as a duty to wait on their superiors in age and station. They do not dine until their *betters*



have risen from the table. After dinner we sang a psalm. This was a good old primitive and pious custom; but in the present state of things it appears rather formal, and by some it is treated with reproachful levity at the time of its performance. Indeed it is affecting to a serious mind, to observe in many respects what an incongruity there is produced by uniting the forms and customs of the good old Puritans with the latitudinarian and licentious spirit in regard to religion which is now prevalent.

"After dinner we proceeded again to the church in procession. The first speaker had scarcely begun his oration when he was interrupted by a noise in the gallery. Two men, who were probably a little intoxicated, were quarreling about a seat or a favourable stand. Some of the troop of light-horsemen who had escorted the governor, went into the gallery with drawn swords, and one of them seized one of the disturbers by the collar and a scuffle ensued between them. The light-horsemen pressed forward to support their companion, and the countrymen from every part of the gallery cried out, 'Let him alone, don't strike him.' The countrymen eventually overcame the troopers, and as I was informed took some of their swords from them and threw them away. The governor at length rose and ordered the sheriff of the county to do his duty forthwith. The sheriff went forward with his white staff and no one attempted resistance. He took the disturbers and put them in prison. I consider this affray as marking the spirit of Americans in general, and of the New Englanders in particular. They will submit to the white staff of peace and civil order, but they scorn to be terrified by red coats and drawn swords, and I hope they will ever retain this spirit. The music composed the assembly when the rioters were removed, and the speaker resumed his subject and possessed a profound attention. When all was finished, except the valedictory oration, the president conferred the degrees. He sat as he did it in a very antique two-armed chair which is a century and a half old, for it is coeval, as I understand, with the erection of the college. The president rose from it, and in Latin asked leave of the governor and council to admit the candidates for degrees to the honours of the college—informing the *honoratissimi* that the *juvenes* were entitled to these honours from their examination. The governor answered in a short, handsome reply in Latin, which he delivered with great propriety; as he also did a short address in English on another occasion. This formality of asking leave was repeated at the conferring of the masters' and medical doctors' degrees—the latter were called *viri* by the president, to distinguish them, I suppose, from the *juvenes*. Twenty-seven bachelors, two masters, and two medical doctors, received on this occasion the honours of the college. The president made the mistake of '*trado hoc librum,*' for '*hunc librum.*' He corrected himself the first time; but he made it the second time and did not correct it; but every time afterwards he had it right. He seems to be deficient in address, and readiness, and recollection; but in real and solid learning, I am told and believe, he excels. The whole was concluded with prayer." . . .

"24th. Sabbath I went to the residence of Dr. Hopkins and preached for him twice to-day. The text of my first discourse was, "Grieve not the

Holy Spirit," &c.—of the second, "This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith." In both exercises I spoke with some freedom. After the public service of the day, I had a conversation with Dr. Hopkins on some points of new divinity, and he conversed very rationally and candidly. He acknowledged to me that there was something difficult and inexplicable in attempting to reconcile the divine agency and influence with perfect human liberty and accountableness, and in explaining how moral evil came into the universe, and how the evil thoughts and actions of creatures are reconcilable with the perfect moral purity and unblameableness of God. I told him that those who are called moderate Calvinists complain that the new divinity men pretend that there is no difficulty in these subjects. He said in reply that he exceedingly disapproved of the conduct and preaching of some young ministers who embrace and propagate such sentiments. He said they were rash and imprudent, and made unjustifiable expressions; and that they proclaimed their peculiar sentiments too much on all occasions, where they had not time fully to explain them and to guard them against abuse. He is considered as the author and champion of the new divinity by some; but he is certainly a man of much more candour, liberality and catholicism than most of his disciples. He is just finishing a system or body of divinity on his own plan. There is nothing striking in his manner and conversation. On the contrary, there is something which would lead a person ignorant of his character to think him rather weak and simple and unthinking. He looks like a vacant minded man, and his conversation on common and ordinary topics is not calculated to remove such an impression. Yet he is certainly a man of a subtle and discriminating mind. He is indeed more calculated for minute inquiries than for comprehensive views. His mental optics seemed formed to see small objects distinctly, but are unable to survey large ones—he sees parts but not the whole. His love of distinguishing sometimes leads him to make distinctions where there are no differences. He separates in reasoning, things which are never separated in fact. His love of metaphysics carries him out of real life; but he appears after all to be a man of real and fervent piety. His congregation is almost extinct, and I have had queries with myself whether his abstruse manner of preaching has not contributed to drive his people from him."

After a certain point in the narrative, Dr. Green divides his matter under several heads, viz., the composition and delivery of sermons—pastoral visitation and visiting the sick—catechizing—chaplaincy in Congress—pestilence—and the like. The value of the statements under these heads varies very much: of many we have no hesitation in saying they are so minute, so merely personal, and so often repeated, that if the will of the author had allowed, they might well have been omitted. Interspersed among these are some of the most agreeable and permanent portions of the book. Dr. Green's observations

on ministerial life and pastoral duty are all founded on successful practice of what he recommends, and are very precious. In regard to pastoral care, we regard his maxims as eminently valuable, the rather because we remember with veneration and gratitude his great wisdom and kindness in dealing with afflicted minds; qualities which have made his *Questions and Counsel*, as published by the American Tract Society, so welcome and so fruitful in many languages.

"I have already mentioned the advice I received from Doctor Witherspoon, 'not to write more than one sermon in a week,' and the reason he assigned, which was, 'if you attempt more you will spoil all;' at the same time he advised me to preach as often as I should be providentially called to the service; but to do it by meditation only, without writing. 'Your prepared sermon,' said he, 'which should be the product of your best efforts, will cover the defects of all the rest; will gain you reputation, and will be gradually accumulating a stock of correct preparations, not only for your old age, if you live to reach it, but for use in travelling, and for repetition after proper interval, to the people of your pastoral charge.' My habit of sermonizing in the former part of my ministry was in strict conformity with the foregoing advice. I recollect but a very few instances of departure from it, and the result has been, that I have numerous manuscript preparations for the pulpit, each of which cost me nearly four days of very severe study. But after I was considerably advanced in ministerial life, although I often wrote at large, yet in order to gain time for reading and pastoral visitation, I wrote only the introduction, method, and some or the whole of the doctrinal part of my discourses, with hints for the application, but without writing in detail. Indeed I know of no method of preaching except the close reading of notes, which I have not practised."

"I remember, that in once instance I was requested to print a sermon, of which, as far as I recollect, I had not written a word. But I always wrote when I could, and as much as I could, consistently with my other engagements, till I left my congregation on my call to assume the presidency of the college of New Jersey. The proper delivery of sermons as well as the proper reading of the scriptures and sacred poetry in the public worship of the sanctuary, are of far more importance than they are too often believed to be by ministers of the gospel. The attainment of a good elocution ought to be regarded as a sacred duty by every candidate for the gospel ministry, for a large share of his future usefulness will depend upon its attainment. It is often slighted as a vain acquisition, calculated to minister to the vanity of being esteemed as an orator. If this be the motive of cultivating an impressive manner of public speaking, by any one who expects to minister in holy things, it cannot certainly be too much abhorred. But every laudable attainment may be pursued from corrupt motives. Let the motive be to do good and to increase usefulness—which are deeply involved in the matter we here contemplate—and eminent piety itself may

urge a candidate for the sacred ministry to acquire the talent of *speaking well*, when he delivers God's holy truth. No man who is not born for it, will ever produce the highest effects of eloquence; but every man who has not some invincible natural defect may become an agreeable public speaker; most men may not only be agreeable, but also impressive. Dr. Witherspoon had a small voice, and used but little gesture in the pulpit, but his utterance was very distinct and articulate; and his whole manner serious and solemn; and no speaker that I ever heard, has thrilled my feelings more than he. President Davies, from what I have heard of him, was probably the most accomplished preacher that our country has produced. His ordinary habit was to lay his notes before him, having made himself so familiar with them, as to give his eyes and action to the audience with freedom. I am persuaded that notes can be used with such address as to remove objections to them from all who believe that a minister ought laboriously to prepare in ordinary circumstances, the discourses that he addresses to the people of his charge, especially on the Lord's day. I have mentioned above, that for a short time I made the experiment of committing my written discourses to memory; but some of my most judicious hearers informed me, that while I did so, I spoke with manifestly less freedom and energy than when my notes were before me."

Dr. Green was Chaplain to Congress, in connexion with Bishop White, from 1792 till 1800. This brought him into daily intercourse with the first men in our country, particularly with Washington. The anecdotes of eloquent orators, in that Periclean age of American eloquence, awaken a mournful interest, in this day, when orators are judged by their wind, and when legislative argument is measured by the newspaper-square-foot. To understand what follows, it should be remembered that he writes concerning a period of much free-thinking.

"About one-third of the members in Congress in each house were commonly present at prayers. On one occasion I expressed to a member, who was a professor of religion and with whom I was well acquainted, the feeling of regret I experienced, that the attendance on prayers was not of a greater number. 'Will you,' said he in reply, 'tell me on your veracity, whether our attendance is not as good as that of the members of your General Assembly, or Synod, at your constituting prayer in the morning?' I was completely confounded with the interrogation; for on recollection I was convinced that our ecclesiastical bodies were not more numerously attended at the opening prayer than was the fact in the Congress of the United States, and this I had to admit to the member to whom I had expressed my regret at the beginning of the conversation on the subject. I have frequently mentioned the fact which I here record to my clerical brethren, but with too little effect to the present hour. It was the usage under President Washington's administration, that the chaplains of Con-



gress should dine with him once in every month, while Congress was in session. This brought me often in the presence of the illustrious man whose fame has filled the world."

The sections relating to the Princeton Theological Seminary, and the Secession from the Presbyterian Church, the controversies in divinity and church government, and the lawsuits, occupy a large space; but to abridge them would clearly be to injure the effect of this the most valuable testimony known to us. We earnestly commend them to those, if any such there are, who continue to ascribe those acts of discipline to malignant motives. Reasons of a like nature would restrain us from entering upon the copious history of Dr. Green's presidential life in the college. In the view of many, this will be thought too copious, and too minute in its details; as materials for future history however, the most trivial events sometimes have their value. Our recollections of Dr. Green connect themselves with this period, and represent him to us as diligent, conscientious, usually stern, yet often affectionately paternal in the discharge of his duties. Especially do we recall the lively and inexpressible interest which he appeared to take in the revivals of religion in the college; the private counsels given by him to inquirers; the continual expositions of the scripture to the assembled faculty and students, in which he surpassed all men whom we have known, so as to leave impressions for life on those who were at the time careless, depraved and resisting; and the extemporaneous Thursday evening lectures, delivered as he sat in his chair in the Sophomore recitation-room, and which, as we then thought, excelled his more laboured efforts. Those who have not known Dr. Green in these relations, and who think of him as a heresy-hunter and a belligerent, altogether miss one aspect of his very decided and uncompromising character. And though his record gives painful evidence that the young men often grieved his soul by their petulance and refractory violence, it also shows that at some of these very times he was fasting and praying before God; so that we marvel the less that we have often heard from some who were youth at that day, that they have never forgotten the pious lessons of President Green. Indeed the literary and scientific part of college life was in his case less prominent than the disciplinary and religious, and his soul manifestly yearned for the salvation of the

youth committed to his charge. So it must be, if the number of candidates for the ministry is to be much increased. Our colleges must be places to which parents shall send their sons with assured hope, as to influences that tend toward their conversion. If our Board of Education is to be reinforced, there is no place from which the auxiliary effort may more hopefully come, than from our grammar-schools and colleges. Our memory of what we have seen again and again in Nassau Hall, convinces us that the prayers of pious founders are still a memorial before God.

Of that period of seclusion, diligence and prayer, which Dr. Green spent in his beloved city of Philadelphia, his record is ample, but abruptly terminated. The labour of copying had become irksome. The last act of his penmanship, one so graceful and noble, was his signature as president of the Pennsylvania Bible Society. The history of his remaining years was confided by himself to the Reverend Joseph H. Jones, D.D., of Philadelphia, and completes the volume. Valuable communications appear from the pens of Doctors Miller, Janeway, McDowell, Plumer, and Murray. The few letters written by Dr. Green, in his best days, are so much superior to the general tenor of his private journals (the same is true of every literary man) that we cannot but express our wonder that so little draught has been made on the epistolary correspondence of one who was for more than half a century in constant intercourse with some of the chief minds in America: possibly this satisfaction is contemplated in another volume. Of the private habits of Dr. Green his biographer gives the following statements.

“For several years before his death he spent the greater part of his time when awake, in exercises of devotion. It was his custom to employ the interval between breakfast and eleven o'clock, in reading the Scriptures, and prayer. After dinner he rested from one to two hours, and at five resumed his private religious exercises, which were continued until six. At this time he prayed for each member of his family by name, next for the church, and then for the pastor. Not long after tea, the household were assembled for worship, which was conducted by himself so long as he was able to do it; afterwards by some inmate of the family, and was never omitted unless on account of some providential hinderance. At nine in the evening he returned to his secret devotions, and continued reading in the Scriptures with several hymns, and in prayer, until he retired to

rest. His exercises in the evening were usually concluded with a hymn. So long as he was able to kneel, he was accustomed to read and pray on his knees after having first pressed the Bible to his lips. This token of reverent affection, however, was never exhibited in the family, nor knowingly in the presence of others. On one occasion it was observed by a person in the room, whom he supposed to have withdrawn; and when subsequently mentioned to Dr. Green, he remarked that it had long been his custom to do it when reading the Bible in secret, not from any superstitious veneration of the cover and leaves of the volume, but out of love to its precious contents. Not long before his last sickness, his mind appeared for a while to be absorbed with painful thoughts and to be greatly depressed. The change was obvious, and so long continued, that his ever vigilant domestic friend was constrained to ask him the cause. He admitted that her conjectures were correct, and that for some days his mental conflicts had been severe and sometimes dreadful. It seems to me, said he, that I can adopt the language of Luther, when he felt that all the devils in hell had been let loose upon him. At the time of this conversation however, the trial appears to have come to its crisis. His mind shortly after recovered its former tranquillity, and his countenance its wonted cheerfulness."

"The decline of Dr. Green was not attended with any positive disease which accelerated his death. Though every menacing symptom was watched by his most assiduous and skilful medical friend, who did much to retard his downward progress, yet the tendencies of more than four score years and five were not to be resisted by any power in the art of healing; and it was evident to all who saw him, that the time of his departure was at hand. How far the change from day to day was alarming to himself, or even perceptible, or what were his mental exercises, could be inferred only from the usual composure of his manner, and placid countenance, indicative of the movements of a mind engaged in meditations of interest and solemnity. So long as he was able to articulate with so much distinctness as to be understood, he requested every clerical friend who entered the room to pray with him. To the remarks and quotations of the Scriptures by his brethren or others, he would usually give his assent by motion of his lips or head, and sometimes by the utterance of a single word. When in one of these interviews, a brother remarked in the language of the apostle Peter, 'Unto you therefore, who believe, he is precious,' he promptly responded, 'Yes, precious Christ, precious Christ, precious Christ,' repeating it three times with the strongest emphasis.

"His wakeful hours at night, which were many, were spent in devotion. Several months before his decease, a member of the family was awakened at midnight by a noise in his room, like the sobbings of a person that was weeping. On going to the door and gently opening it, he was found with his eyes closed and lips moving, as if speaking in whispers with the greatest earnestness, while his cheeks and pillow were wet with his tears. When asked in the morning without any allusion to what we have mentioned, how he had slept, he answered, that he had 'had a precious night in communion with his Saviour.' One of the most interesting and impressive scenes of his

last days occurred on the Sabbath but one before his death. After the family had returned from the morning service, it was observed on entering his room, that his mind was burdened with meditations, to which he wished to give utterance, and that his emotions were producing a restlessness and agitation that were inexplicable and alarming. To the inquiries of his ever watchful friend, what was the cause of his disquiet, and what she should do to relieve him, he appeared to be unable to give any verbal reply; when it occurred to her that she would suggest the reading of the Scriptures, to which he readily assented. The portion to which she turned was the first chapter of the Gospel of John, and finding that he became tranquil and attentive, she read deliberately to the close. The sixteenth verse, 'And of his fulness have we all received, and grace, for grace,' was a passage of peculiar interest to him, and appeared to produce a flood of touching reminiscences. Several years ago, when confined to his chamber by sickness, he had composed three sermons on this text, which he afterwards preached to the edification of his whole congregation, and to the special benefit of several persons who received from them their permanent religious impressions. The reading of this chapter not only allayed that distressing nervous excitement which preceded it, but seemed to impart a sort of inspiration by which his faculties were for the time emancipated: his tongue was loosed, and he burst out into an ecstasy of joy and thanksgiving; 'blessing God for the gift of his Son and the gospel, which contained the record of his coming, life, crucifixion, resurrection, and intercession. That he had been permitted to preach this gospel, and had been honoured with any measure of success in his ministry. For the comforts which the gospel had imparted to him, and the ineffably glorious hopes it had inspired of a state of sinless perfection beyond the grave.' His voice was loud, his enunciation clear and distinct as it had been in the best days of his ministry: and this elevated strain of praise and holy exultation was continued until his strength was exhausted, and he sunk into a sweet and refreshing sleep. The scene was indescribably impressive and solemn. No person that did not see it, can imagine the majesty of the preacher and the power of his utterance, scarcely more unexpected than if he had spoken from the coffin, in which his dust was to be laid before the return of a second Sabbath. It seemed to be a momentary triumph of grace over the infirmities of expiring nature, a taking leave of mortality and the labours of his militant state, like the dying effort of Jacob; after which the Patriarch 'gathered up his feet into the bed and yielded up the ghost.' With this brief eucharistic service, his communion with earthly things ceased. From the time of this affecting occurrence his change was rapid and obvious to all. His difficulty in speaking was so great that he did not make the effort, but remained silent with his eyes closed, except when opened to signify to some inquirer his consciousness and understanding of the question which he had not the power to answer. The occasional motion of his lips and lifting of his hands and clasping them upon his breast, were indications that his thoughts were absorbed in the exercises of meditation and prayer.

As his strength diminished there were intervals more and more prolonged of sleep, when these tokens of his thoughts were suspended. There



seemed to be no bodily suffering nor mental disquiet, but a peaceful waiting for the release of his spirit, which at last was called away so gently, that the moment of its escape was not perceived even by those who were watching to see it. At the hour of six in the morning of the 19th of May, 1848, he was lying in his usual position, his face upward, arms extended, and hands clasped as if engaged in prayer, when one of his hands became detached from the other and fell at his side; the other remained elevated a moment or two longer, when it began to sink gradually until it nearly reached the body, when its muscular strength failed and it suddenly dropped. At the same instant the motion of his lips ceased, and it was discovered that he had ceased to breathe. Such were the closing scenes of his long and useful life, and some of the circumstances that attended it. Had it been prolonged until the 6th of July, he would have completed his 88th year. Thus he came to his 'grave in a full age, like as a shock of corn cometh in his season.' It was a coincidence noticed by many, that Dr. Green and Dr. Chalmers both died during the meetings of the General Assemblies of their respective churches, and 'that Dr. Green was buried on, or very near the anniversary of Dr. Chalmers' burial in the preceding year.' Both had occupied positions of equal prominence in devising and executing measures which resulted in great changes in their respective churches. Both lived to see the fulfilment of their expectations in the results of their agency, and both possessed to the last, in an eminent degree, the confidence and affection of their brethren."

The work closes with a careful and touching portraiture of Doctor Green as a minister and a Christian. In our judgment all that the editor has appended is prepared with prudence, discrimination, and much finish of style. If some regard the character here given as too gentle and peaceful for that of the Dr. Green they knew, they may remember for their correction that their own views are perhaps formed upon more slender means of observation, that the real motives and temper of every man are liable to misapprehension, and that in a life of eighty-seven years there is room for great diversities and alternations, seasons of action and seasons of repose.

Some views of Dr. Green's character, which are wanting in the memoir, have been supplied by the correspondence in the appendix, which carries authority from the eminent names of the writers. In none of these do we consider our revered friend as over-praised, for his good sense, devotion, honour, truth or courage; in few of them is there any adequate account of Dr. Green's force and prominence as a pulpit orator. This is part of the tax paid for a long life; the few who remember the finished preparations and awakening delivery of his prime will

scarcely find credence among such as know only his decay. For similar reasons, the whole impression made by this autobiography, considered as a specimen of Dr. Green's pen, is exceedingly below what would have been produced by a larger presentation of extracts from his best writings, especially from his copious correspondence. The portrait here given is true, interesting and instructive, but the likeness is that of 'Paul the aged.' If we understand the preface, it was at one time thought best to construct an entire biography out of these materials; in our opinion it would be the only method of doing justice to the excellencies of Dr. Green in his prime of life. As it is, the book has a sacredness in our esteem, bringing us into the privacy of one whom in our childhood we wondered at, in our youth dreaded, and in our riper years revered and loved.

---

ART. VI.—*The Question of Negro Slavery and the New Constitution of Kentucky.* By Robert J. Breckinridge, D.D.

The Legislature of Kentucky having submitted the question to the people whether a convention should be called to revise the constitution of the state, and the people having decided that question in the affirmative, the character of that convention became a matter of absorbing interest to the inhabitants of that important commonwealth. The point about which the people were most divided, and to which public attention was principally directed, was negro slavery. The question in debate was, What provision shall be engrafted in the new constitution in relation to that subject? Shall the constitution make provision for the permanent existence and indefinite increase of slavery? or shall it prohibit the introduction of slaves from abroad, and provide for the gradual emancipation of those already within the borders of the state, or at least leave the subject open for the action of the Legislature and of the people, untrammelled by any constitutional provisions? The question at issue was no less than this, Whether Kentucky was to remain for an indefinite period a slaveholding state, or whether it was to be allowed to take its place among the free commonwealths of this great confederation. This is a momentous question, involving

the interests for generations of the state itself, and affecting in no small measure the whole union. No wonder, therefore, that the public mind in Kentucky was deeply agitated by this discussion, and no wonder that the eyes of the whole country watched the progress of the struggle with the liveliest interest. For months previous to the election of members of the convention to frame a new constitution, the press teemed with arguments and appeals, public lecturers and orators travelled over the state to address the people, and county and state conventions were held to embody and express the sentiments of the contending parties.

In Fayette county, including the city of Lexington, and embracing a larger number of extensive slave-owners than almost any other county of the state, a convention was held on the 14th of April last. "The object of the meeting having been explained in a few eloquent remarks by the Hon. Henry Clay and Rev. R. J. Breckinridge, on motion of the latter gentleman, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted: 1st, That this meeting, composed of citizens of the county of Fayette, met in pursuance of public notice, to consider the question of the perpetuation of slavery in this commonwealth, considering that hereditary slavery as it exists amongst us,

I. Is contrary to the natural rights of mankind;

II. Is opposed to the fundamental principles of free government;

III. Is inconsistent with a state of sound morality;

IV. Is hostile to the prosperity of the commonwealth;

We are therefore of opinion, that it ought not to be made perpetual, and that the convention about to meet to amend the constitution of this State affords a proper occasion, on which steps should be taken to ameliorate the condition of slavery, in such a way as shall be found practicable in itself, just as it regards the masters of slaves, and beneficial to the slaves themselves.

2d. That in order to concert with those who agree with us, throughout the State, a plan of action suitable to be adopted on this occasion, and to agree with them upon a common platform of principles, this meeting appoints the following citizens, and recommends as many others as are of similar sentiments and can conveniently attend, to meet at Frankfort on the 25th inst., dele-

gates from other parts of the State, similarly appointed, for the purpose herein expressed." Then follow the names of thirty gentlemen appointed as delegates to the State Convention.

When the Convention met at Frankfort, the Rev. Dr. R. J. Breckinridge submitted a document, which after being amended with his concurrence, was adopted, and is as follows: viz.

"This Convention, composed of citizens of the common wealth of Kentucky, and representing the opinions and wishes of a large number of our fellow-citizens throughout the commonwealth, met in the capitol on the 25th of April, 1849, to consider what course it becomes those who are opposed to the increase and to the perpetuity of slavery in this State to pursue in the approaching canvass for members of the Convention, called to amend the Constitution, adopts the propositions which follow, as expressing its judgment in the premises:

"1. Believing that involuntary hereditary slavery, as it exists by law in this State, is injurious to the prosperity of the Commonwealth, inconsistent with the fundamental principles of free government, contrary to the natural rights of mankind, and injurious to a pure state of morals, we are of opinion that it ought not to be increased, and that it ought not to be perpetuated in this commonwealth.

"2. That any scheme of emancipation ought to be prospective, operating exclusively upon negroes born after the adoption of the scheme, and connected with colonization.

"3. That we recommend the following points as those to be insisted on in the new Constitution, and that candidates be run in every county in the State, favorable to these or similar constitutional provisions. 1. The absolute prohibition of the importation of any more slaves to Kentucky. 2. The complete power in the people of Kentucky to enforce and perfect in or under the new Constitution, a system of gradual prospective emancipation of slaves.

"4. This Convention confines its recommendation to the question of negro slavery, and makes no expression of opinion on any other topic.

HENRY CLAY, of Bourbon, Pres't.

HENRY WINGATE, } V. Pres'ts.  
W. P. BOON, }

Frank Ballinger, } Sec's.  
Bland Ballard, }  
O. S. Poston, } Assist't Sec's.  
Samuel Shy, }

Such is the standard raised by the friends of emancipation in Kentucky. The struggle maintained with so much vigour around it has for the present ended. The members for the convention to revise the constitution of the State have been elected, and not more than one or two emancipationists if any, accord-



ing to the public papers, have been elected. It may be difficult for those out of the State to discern all the causes of this lamentable defeat. There are, however, some things connected with the subject patent to every observer. In the first place, the failure of the cause of emancipation is not to be referred to any want of ability on the part of its advocates. Those advocates comprise some of the most distinguished men not only of Kentucky but of the Union; men who have no superiors in the power to control public sentiment. If the cause of freedom could have been carried, it must have been carried by such men. If any appeals could produce conviction, it would have been produced by the address mentioned at the head of this article. Self-interest, ignorance, and prejudice are proof against any thing, but the human mind, when unbiassed and sufficiently enlightened to comprehend their import, cannot resist such arguments, nor harden itself against such sentiments as are here presented. It must be conceded then, that the cause of emancipation in Kentucky has failed for the present, in spite of the exertions of men of the highest order of talents of which the country can boast.

Again, some seem disposed to refer this failure to the lukewarmness of the churches in Kentucky. We are not prepared to speak on this subject for other churches, but surely this reproach cannot fairly be brought against our own church. The Presbyterians have taken the lead in this struggle. There is not a prominent man in the Synod of Kentucky, who has not been conspicuous for his zeal and efforts in behalf of emancipation. No names in connection with this subject, are more prominent than those of Drs. R. J. Breckinridge, John C. Young, William L. Breckinridge, and of the Rev. Mr. Robinson of Frankfort. As far as we know, there is not a single Presbyterian minister, whose name is found among the advocates of slavery. We advert to this fact with the more satisfaction because the steady opposition of our General Assembly to the principles of the abolitionists, has subjected our church to the reproach or misconstruction of fanatical parties both at home and abroad. It is now seen that the principles which our church has always avowed on this subject, are as much opposed to the doctrine that slavery is a good institution, which ought to be perpetuated; as to the opposite dogma, that slaveholding is in itself sinful, and a bar to christian communion.

With perfect consistency our church has borne its testimony against the doctrine that immediate and universal emancipation was the imperative duty of all slave-holders; and the no less fanatical opinion that one class of men may rightfully keep another in ignorance and degradation, in order to keep them in bondage. It has steadily inculcated on the one hand, that the holding of slaves is analogous to political despotism, and is therefore right or wrong according to circumstances; and, on the other, that neither the slave owner nor the despot had a right to use his power to prevent the intellectual, moral, and social improvement of its subjects, in order that his authority may be undisturbed and perpetuated. The old school Presbyterians have been the great conservative body, in reference to this subject in our country. They have stood up as a wall against the flood of abolitionism, which would have overwhelmed the church and riven asunder the State. But at the same time they have been the truest friends of the slaves and the most effectual advocates of emancipation. Their failure in Kentucky is in a great measure due to the unhealthy state of the public mind produced by the abolition controversy, and to the want of preparation on the part of the people. We sincerely rejoice that Presbyterians as a body, were found on the right side in this great conflict, and that the failure deplored, is not to be imputed to their remissness or indifference.

Again, the impression seems very general that the emancipationists have been defeated by the slave-holders. This is a great mistake. A large and most influential class of the slave-holders are themselves emancipationists. The struggle was not between the slave-holding and the non-slaveholding part of the community. Had such been the case, the issue would have been very different. It is probable, indeed, that a majority of the slave-holders are opposed to emancipation, but they form numerically too small a portion of the state to determine its action. Dr. Breckinridge estimates the slave-holders in Kentucky, as only one-eighth of the population. The state has about 600,000 white inhabitants, and 200,000 slaves. There are 140,000 persons entitled to vote, and of these not more than 20,000 are owners of slaves. Here then we have 120,000 non-slaveholding voters, and 20,000 voters owning slaves, and yet the state has gone for slavery by an overwhelming majority. This is not the work of the slave-holders. If any suppose that though numer-

ically a small portion of the people, by their superior wealth they influence the votes of their poorer neighbours, they evince a great ignorance of the real state of feeling in this country. Office-holders and actual subordinates whose bread is dependant on the favour of superiors, may be under their political control. But in the great majority of cases, there is an antagonism between the rich and the poor. The whole tendency of our system is not only to throw the actual power into the hands of the masses, but to make them jealous of any appearance of control. They almost uniformly assert their independence by going, on mere questions of politics, in opposition to the wealthier portion of the community. The fact therefore that the non-slaveholders in Kentucky have voted against emancipation, is not to be attributed to the influence of the slave-owners. Their conduct in this matter is to be attributed to various causes. There is a natural opposition between the free whites and the slaves, both as a race and as a class. Without for a moment admitting that there is any essential difference between the different races of men, it must be acknowledged there is the same difference between races that there is between individuals of the same race. We do not deny the name of brother to a man of the Caucasian race who may happen to be intellectually and physically inferior to the majority of the members of the same great family; nor is there any doubt as to the essential equality of those particular families, who from one generation to another exhibit marked inferiority to others of the same nation. This diversity is observable in every department of creation. All oaks of the same species are not alike, much less are the several species of the same standard. In like manner all men are not equally endowed with the gifts of God, neither are the several races of men on a perfect equality. There is a marked difference, physical, intellectual and social, between the Caucasian and the Malay. They are indeed of one blood. They are the children of the same parents. They are brethren having the same nature in all its essential attributes, but separation and the protracted operation of physical and moral causes, have given each its peculiar and indelible type. And where there is diversity there is sure to be superiority and inferiority. While therefore we joyfully admit the negro race to be bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh, to be brethren of the same great family to which

we ourselves belong, it would be folly to deny that the blacks are as a race inferior to the whites. This is a fact which the history of the world places beyond dispute. Whether under a process of culture, extending through generations, they might rise to an equality with their more favoured brethren, is a question which we need not discuss. It is probable that in their highest developement they would retain their distinctive characteristics, and be our superiors in some attributes of our common nature, and our inferiors in others. However this might be, it is indisputable that at present, in all parts of the world, the blacks as a race are inferior to the whites. This is a fact which cannot fail to have its effect on the minds of men. It leads too naturally to contempt and disregard of the rights and feelings of the inferior race. The more ignorant the whites are, the more violent and unreasonable are their prejudices on this subject. When therefore the question is presented to a community whether an inferior race, hitherto held as slaves, shall be emancipated, one of the strongest sources of opposition to such a measure is sure to be found in this pride of race. The whites, and especially the less cultivated portion of them, revolt at the idea that the distinction between themselves and those whom they have always looked upon as their inferiors, should be done away. They regard it as an insult, or as robbing them of a privilege.

To this is to be added the prejudice of class. The negroes are the labouring class. That portion of the whites who sustain themselves by manual employment, have a great jealousy of the interference of the blacks. They will not associate with them, and they dread the idea of their competing with them as mechanics or labourers. While slaves, the blacks are confined to the plantations of their masters; when emancipated they go where they please, and enter into whatever employment they find open to them. To this association and competition the labouring whites have everywhere the strongest repugnance. We are not surprised, therefore, at the vote of the non-slaveholders in Kentucky. It would be the same to-morrow in New York or Philadelphia. The labouring whites of those cities would doubtless vote to set free slaves at a distance, but if the question was about the emancipation of thousands of negroes to be their own associates and competitors in labour, we doubt not nine out of ten would vote against it. And this was



the light in which the question most probably presented itself to the majority of the people of Kentucky. That emancipation was to be gradual, and attended with the expatriation of the blacks, would not produce much impression on their minds. They took the matter up in gross as a simple question of freedom or slavery for the blacks.

There is another consideration, mistaken indeed, but still effective, which is apt to operate on the minds of whites against the emancipation of the blacks. While the latter are slaves their masters are obliged to provide for them when disabled by age, sickness or dissolute habits. If emancipated, they are thrown on the community. This is a burden which the non-slaveholding whites are not disposed to assume. They are wont to say, Let the masters take care of their own blacks. They have had the good of them, let them retain the burden of their support.

Perhaps a still more operative feeling is that of antagonism to the free states. The recent discussions on abolitionism have generated a state of morbid excitement in the public mind. The unreasonableness of a part of the people in the northern states, has produced a corresponding unreasonableness in a portion of the south. The free and slave states have been placed in a very undesirable position in relation to each other. They are assumed to have opposing interests, if not mutually hostile intentions. The consequence is, we find the whole population of southern states going together on questions relating solely to the supposed interests of slave-holders. The great majority of the inhabitants of those states own no slaves. They have no interest in what enhances or depresses the value of that species of property. Yet all their sympathies are with the slaveholders, and against their non-slaveholding brethren at the north. This is not to be referred to any fondness for the institution of slavery, nor to the predominant influence of slaveholders, but to state pride and state feeling. It is easy to see how this feeling must operate. Whatever identifies or characterizes a community, determines the form which its common life or spirit assumes. If a state is monarchical or aristocratical in its constitution, it will be so in its spirit. It is not only the privileged classes who contend for its peculiar institutions, but the majority of the people are pervaded by the same spirit. It requires a great

amount of real oppression to destroy in the middle and lower classes this sympathy with the characteristic constitution of their country. Nine Englishmen out of ten will be found to defend hereditary nobility and a princely hierarchy, especially in antagonism with republicanism. In like manner the non-slaveholders of the south, though almost as numerous in comparison to the owners of slaves as the commons of England in comparison to the aristocratical classes, stand up with fervent zeal in behalf of their peculiar institution. This is the reason why a few thousand slaveholders wield the authority of a whole state, and make the majority of the people think they are contending for their own rights and interests, while in fact they are contending for the exclusive advantage of a small minority.

All these causes to which we have adverted as tending to account for the non-slaveholders of Kentucky voting to perpetuate slavery, owe their force, it must be admitted, in a great measure to ignorance. If the people were duly enlightened, they would rise above their influence. This is obvious for two reasons—first, that the most enlightened class of the population in our slaveholding states, unless personally interested in slavery, are opposed to its being perpetuated. The advocates of perpetual slavery are a certain portion of slave owners, and the uneducated portion of the people. The great body of enlightened and disinterested men even in slave states, groan under the institution of slavery as an incubus, and long for deliverance. Second, it is easy to see that the reasons referred to have no real force, and that they could not control the action of men capable of estimating the real merits of the case. It is a mistake founded in ignorance that emancipation would operate injuriously on the interests of the labouring portion of the whites. It is capable of demonstration, as indeed Dr. Breckinridge has demonstrated, that freeing the blacks, according to the plan proposed in Kentucky, would greatly improve the condition of the working class among the whites. To see this, however, requires both knowledge and attention. It is therefore overlooked or disbelieved by that large class who are too ignorant to calculate remote consequences, and are governed by the mere appearance of things. We fear therefore that the cause of emancipation cannot be carried in those states in which the

blacks are generally diffused among the whites, until education has done its proper work among the latter.

In order to the proper understanding of this subject, it is necessary to consider the distinctive features of the plan proposed by the friends of emancipation in Kentucky. It differs essentially from that of the abolitionists. It was, in the first place, to be progressive and not immediate. Against the plan of setting the whole slave population free at once, the objections are so great that it has never been adopted by a slaveholding community. People at a distance, who do not see, and who do not expect to suffer from the evils attending such a measure, under the control of abstract ideas, may clamour for immediate emancipation, but those who are to bear the burden of hundreds of thousands of ignorant and generally indolent blacks, content to live in the lowest condition, will be slow to believe that any principle of duty calls for such a sacrifice. It is not a matter of right as it concerns the slaves. No man has a right to any privilege which he is incompetent to exercise—be he white or black. And even if personally competent, his exercise or enjoyment of such privilege may be rightfully restrained by a regard to the best interests of the community. Minors, as a class, are not competent to exercise the elective franchise; they have therefore no right to exercise it. Individual minors may be as competent as any other men, and yet the good of the whole justifies their being deprived of the privilege. On the same principle the right of voting is denied to females, though personally competent to exercise it with wisdom. If therefore the blacks as a class are incompetent to exercise, with benefit to themselves or others, the privileges of personal or political liberty, then, as long as that incompetency continues, they have no right to those privileges. This argument of course supposes the incompetency to be real. And it furnishes no justification of measures, the design or tendency of which is to produce and perpetuate such incompetency. All we contend for is that there is no foundation in morals for the reckless application of "the doctrine of inalienable rights" to the case of slaves, who from their physical, intellectual or moral condition, are incompetent to exercise the rights of freemen. It is, therefore, no valid objection to the Kentucky plan of emancipation that it conflicts with the inalienable right of men to personal freedom

Whether it was not too slow in its proposed operation, whether it did not unnecessarily prolong the period of bondage, and unfairly exclude all the existing generation of blacks from its benefits, are questions of detail into which we do not feel competent to enter. The advantages of any plan must depend in a great measure, not only on its radical principles, but on its special provisions. And the question which the friends of freedom may have to decide, is not what plan is best, but what is feasible. It would certainly be unwise to refuse everything, because unable to carry the measure they might consider most desirable.

It strikes us that it would be a great improvement on the plan which contemplates the liberation only of those slaves yet to be born, to engraft some provision for the emancipation of a portion at least of those now in existence. There are many obvious advantages connected with the Spanish system which has been adverted to before in our pages. The essential features of that plan are these. It assumes, what we believe is universally true, that the slaves are allowed and have the opportunity to make money for themselves. This is done by working at extra hours, by raising produce for the market, and by executing errands and commissions of various kinds. The money thus earned they are in all slave countries permitted to use as they please. In the next place, this plan provides for the appointment of a public officer who, on application of the slave, is required to set a value on his services, which the master is bound to accept. As soon as the slave has accumulated one-sixth of the sum at which he has been valued and paid it to his master, he has Monday free. When he has gained another sixth, he has Tuesday free; and so on until his whole time becomes his own. In this way he is trained to habits of industry and self-control, and prepared to provide for himself. If with this system could be connected some provision for liberating the wives and children of those who had worked out their own freedom, the plan of progressive emancipation would be relieved of much of its apparent injustice. It is undoubtedly hard, that the whole existing generation of slaves should be excluded from the benefit of any plan of emancipation that may be adopted.

Another provision of this plan is that it proposed to secure



compensation to the owners of slaves. This has been resisted on two grounds, first that the claim to the service of the slaves is an unrighteous claim, and therefore the loss of those services is not a proper ground of compensation; and second, that the master must ultimately even in a pecuniary point of view, be a gainer by emancipation. As to the former of these grounds, it is enough to say that the claim of the master is not necessarily unrighteous. The objection has its foundation in the assumption that all slaveholding is sinful. If that principle is false, then the conclusion drawn from it is vitiated. Besides, it is to be remembered that slavery is the work not of the individual, but of the community. It could not exist without positive enactments. The community is responsible for its existence. If the people, in their capacity as a commonwealth, have made laws sanctioning the existence of slavery, they have entered into a tacit, but binding contract with their fellow-citizens to respect the right of property in slaves. If they come to think that such right ought to be abolished, or that the interests of the commonwealth demand the emancipation of the slaves, it would be unjust to make the loss fall exclusively on the owners. The fault or error was that of the community; it was for the common good, the laws establishing slavery were enacted, and therefore the whole community should share in the loss attending the repeal of those laws. If by laws of the state men have been authorized and induced to invest their capital in any species of property, be it roads, manufactories, mines, or slaves, it would be obviously unjust to take such property from them, without a compensation. In the eye of the law it makes no difference wherein such property may consist, if the law has sanctioned it. The injustice lies in visiting upon the individual the sin of the community. If therefore the state has authorized the holding of slaves, the state must bear the expense of rectifying its own mistakes, when it comes to see that slavery is a public burden.

The other ground of opposing all compensation to the owners of slaves, is perfectly valid, if it really exists. If the master suffers no loss, he is entitled to no compensation. If emancipation makes him richer, he has no claim to be paid for it. There may be circumstances, in isolated communities, where slavery is such a burden on the master, that to liberate his slaves would

be equivalent to cancelling a mortgage on his estate. Such, however, is evidently not the case in this country. Slavery is every where, in some form, profitable to the masters. To deprive them of their slaves would be not only to take from them their capital, but to render unavailable their estates in land. Even if eventually from the rise of real estate, and the general prosperity induced by the abolition of slavery, the slave-owner should find his condition improved, the immediate effect of emancipation would be greatly to limit his resources. The resulting benefit would come in most cases too late, to be a real compensation to the present owners. On every principle, therefore, we think the friends of emancipation acted wisely and justly in engrafting the principle of compensation on their proposed plan.

Another feature of that plan was the expatriation of the liberated blacks. This also when feasible is wise. There are natural laws which forbid the union of distinct races in the same commonwealth. Where the difference is slight, as between Saxons and Celts, or the Teutonic and Romaic families, the different elements are soon fused. But even here we find that they often refuse to combine and remain apart for ages, the weaker constantly sinking, and the stronger constantly advancing. We have examples of this in the French paysans of Canada, and Louisiana. The effect of the amalgamation of distinct races is seen in the physically, intellectually and socially degraded mongrel inhabitants of Mexico and South America. In these cases the chief elements were the Spanish and Indians, elements less widely separated than the Anglo Saxon and the Negro. The amalgamation of these races must inevitably lead to the deterioration of both. It would fill the country with a feeble and degraded population, which must ultimately perish. For it is a well ascertained fact that the mulatto is far more frail than either the white man or the negro. We read in the disastrous physical effects of the amalgamation of the blacks and whites, a clear intimation that such amalgamation is contrary to the will of God, and therefore is not an end which statesmen ought in any way to facilitate.

If amalgamation would be productive of the most lamentable evils to the country, it is no less undesirable that the two races should live together as distinct. This again is forbid by natural

laws which we can neither abrogate nor counteract. It is a law that the stronger and more numerous race should displace the weaker. The weaker may be absorbed and assimilated, where the difference is slight, but if the difference is so great as to keep the races apart, one of two results seems invariably to follow, either the weaker race dies out, or it is reduced to a state of bondage, and is then kept in a good physical condition as an instrument of labour, at the expense of its intellectual and social improvement. The former of these results we see exemplified in the disappearance of the aborigines of this country. The same process is rapidly going on in the islands of the Pacific ocean. It is very likely that the blacks will prove the stronger race in the West India Islands, and in some other places still nearer the equator. In some of those islands the lowest class of the population, is a race of white men. Whether white or black be in the ascendancy, the law is that the weaker sinks and perishes in the presence of the stronger. There can be no question that in this country the blacks are the weaker race, and therefore if emancipated and kept distinct, they must sink and gradually perish. Such has been the experience of the world. Individual instances of excellence and prosperity will doubtless occur, but all experience shows that the only chance for any race radically distinct from another, to arrive at general prosperity, is that it must be kept separate and placed in circumstances favourable to its development.

Expatriation, therefore, when practicable is an essential feature of any wise plan of emancipation. It is best for the blacks themselves by removing them from circumstances hostile to their improvement, and placing them in a situation where an unobstructed career is opened before them. It is best for the country, for the places occupied by an inferior race, incapable of general improvement so long as they remain among whites, will soon be filled up by Europeans and Americans. The State, freed from its black population, would soon find itself peopled with intelligent and prosperous farmers and mechanics from other portions of the Union and from the Old World. That this would be an advantage, no man in his senses can doubt. The only thing that would be lost by such a change would be the race of masters. There would no longer be a class of men owners of their fellow-men, and exalted by such ownership, in

their own conception into a superior class of beings. Few will be disposed to contend, unless slaveholders themselves, that slavery is really desirable from its influence on the masters. It is indeed an argument which privileged classes are accustomed to use, that the institution of nobility is necessary to the highest development of our nature. The robber barons of the middle ages, who could neither read nor write, looked with contempt, not only on their serfs, but on the merchants, citizens and learned men of their generation, and regarded all measures which tended to break down the distinction between themselves and others, as fraught with danger to the true nobility of man. With the progress of civilization, these ideas are fast disappearing from the old world, and they are not likely to find a permanent abode among our planters. Our republican institutions are not favourable to the notion, that free men, though farmers or mechanics, are inferior either to slaves or to their owners. The comparison between the slaveholding and the non-slaveholding portions of the Union, as to every thing which constitutes national prosperity, must at once settle the question whether slavery be conducive to the general good. The number of men in our country is very small, who deliberately maintain that a State, with a population one-fourth whites and three-fourths blacks, is in a more desirable situation than are those whose inhabitants are free white men. The latter is immeasurably stronger for all purposes of good, and is more capable of progress in agriculture, commerce and in all that is desirable. It is, however labour lost to attempt to prove that a free white population is more to be desired than either slaves, or liberated blacks. It cannot, therefore, be rationally disputed that freeing a State from its coloured people, would be the greatest of all temporal blessings that could be conferred upon it. On this subject, all the great men of our history have been of one opinion, whether living at the North or at the South.

The advantages of expatriation or of colonization, however, are confined neither to the blacks nor to the commonwealth from which they are removed. Transported to the rising republic of Liberia, the free negroes carry with them the seeds of religion, civilization and of liberty to an entire continent. They perform for Africa the high mission which our fore-fathers have performed for America; and make Africa for the black



race what the United States now are for Europe and the world. The designs of Providence are already so far unfolded as to be deciphered with no small confidence. God seems to have brought the negroes to our land that, after sustaining a state of pupillage in this house of bondage, they may return as to their land of promise, to the habitation assigned them in the general apportionment of our globe.

To this feature of the Kentucky plan of emancipation several serious objections, however, have been made. It is said to be a violation of the rights of the blacks. This country, it is maintained, is as much theirs as ours; and consequently that we have no more right to send them away than they have to send us. We admit the force of this objection, under existing circumstances, as far as it concerns those blacks who are already free. But the case is very different in regard to those who are now in bondage. To render their present condition permanent would be a great injury to them and to the community. To free them is to confer upon them a great boon, and that gift may rightfully be connected with any conditions which their own benefit and the public good may demand. It is a great fallacy to suppose that the abstract rights of men can be enforced at all times and under all circumstances. The right to choose our own place of abode, as the right of property, is necessarily subject to many limitations. The parent has the right to take with him his minor children when he leaves the crowded provinces of Great Britain or Germany, and seeks a wider and more hospitable home in America or Australia. No injury is inflicted on his children, and their right to remain in their native country is subordinate to the right of the parent. The slaves in this country are in a state of pupillage. They are minors. They stand in that relation of dependence and inferiority in which a state of minority essentially consists. They may therefore be rightfully treated as minors and disposed of without their consent in any way consistent with benevolence and justice. If a great good to them as well as to those they leave behind, be designed in their removal, there is no principle of right violated in their expatriation.

The expense attending any extended scheme of colonization is another objection to the plan. The expense, however, of any scheme is not to be measured by its actual cost, but by the im-

portance of the object and the resources at command for carrying it into effect. Measured by this standard, the expense of colonization is inconsiderable. It is too great for individuals, but not too great for a commonwealth. Fifty dollars a head are said to be sufficient to meet the cost, not only of transferring the emigrants to Africa, but also of sustaining them for the first six months after their arrival in their new home. There are many ways in which such a sum could be procured. It is less than the clear profit of one year's labour of an emancipated slave. It would be more generous for the state to provide for the expense of removal from her general resources, but there would be no injustice in requiring the slave to labour for his own outfit.

A much more serious objection arises from the danger of overwhelming the infant colonies in Africa with an unprepared and therefore reckless population. This danger is great. The history of the world teaches us that civilization does not spring up within any community, it must be introduced from abroad. The original state of man was a state of high civilization, in the truest sense of the term, and savagism is an apostacy perfectly hopeless, so far as the inherent recuperative powers of the race are concerned. If therefore we colonize a country with savages, or imperfectly civilized men, they will continue barbarians or soon lapse into a savage state. We have in St. Domingo an illustration of this general truth. The negroes of that island were not advanced to such a condition of moral and social improvement, when they expelled their European masters, as to enable them to make progress in civilization. They are, in most parts of the island, but little in advance of their condition when slaves. And they will remain, in all probability, in their present degraded state, unless the influence of Christianity is brought to bear upon them from without. There is therefore great danger that uneducated colonists introduced into Africa, instead of raising the natives should sink into barbarism themselves. To guard against this danger it is essential that the foundations of a colony should consist of truly enlightened and religious men, in such numbers and in such a state of advancement, as to give the community its character, to create its life, so that all new accessions should be mastered and assimilated. This is the first and most important condi-

tion for successful colonization, more important even than abundance of land and salubrity of climate. It should never be forgotten that the character of nations is formed in their cradles. It depends mainly upon the germ which is first planted. The character of these United States is distinctly traceable to the character of the first colonists. So is that of Mexico and South America, and it will take ages to counteract the strength of this original impulse. We can never be sufficiently thankful as a nation that the original settlers of this country were pious and enlightened men and true Protestants; and that they were numerous enough to give character to its institutions, and create a public spirit, before the floods of ignorance and Romanism were opened upon us. Except in Maryland, there were scarcely any other than Protestants among the emigrants to this country for nearly a century and a half. Had the annual thousands of Romanists which for the last twenty or thirty years have been pouring in upon us, commenced their flow in the infancy of our country, we should have been overwhelmed, and become an Ireland or Austria on a larger scale. Next then in importance to the original character of a colony, is the character of the annual accessions to their numbers from abroad. The new colonists should not be so numerous as to oppress the resources, and choak the avenues of life in these recent settlements, and they should be sufficiently enlightened to fall in with the spirit of the community of which they become members. As the colony advances in strength it will be able to bear more—to receive and dispose of larger accessions, and even to master uncongenial materials, which at an earlier period of its history would master it.

It is true, then, that if the colony of Liberia was to be flooded with thousands of uneducated negroes, just released from bondage, they would be in imminent danger of relapsing into barbarism, and the light of civilization and Christianity just kindled on the dark coast of Africa would be extinguished. The plan in contemplation, however, does not propose to send out new colonists either in such numbers or of such a character, as to incur the danger of which we have spoken. It proposes to send annually only that class which year by year attains a certain age, and which has been in a long course of training for their new responsibilities. Instead of being a burden to the

colony, such men would be to it what the annual accessions from Europe were to our country during the first fifty years of its history. The colony would thus be enlarged and strengthened just in proportion as its strength would be taxed. In a few years it would be prepared to receive increasing numbers, until at length it would feel as little burdened by any probable amount of immigration, as we now are by the hundreds of thousands of Europeans, who annually seek among us an asylum from want or oppression. There is no reason why the colonies on the coast of Africa may not in time exhibit the same cheering spectacles of rising republics, which is now afforded by the almost annual birth of new states in our own happy country. Africa affords a wide field of fertile, unoccupied land, a climate suited to the black race, and the native neighbouring population belonging to the same great division of the human family, instead of melting away before the colonists, as the Indians have here disappeared before the whites, will gradually be assimilated and absorbed. This is one of the brightest prospects now open for our world. It is the great hope of Africa. We fully agree with Dr. Breckinridge, when he says that the plan of African colonization "is one of the greatest, most fruitful, and most sublime events of any age. The great necessity of the world at this moment, is a free, civilized, Christian, and powerful state within the tropics; a necessity felt through every period of the world's history, and now about to be realized. The western coast of Africa, is, in every point of view, the most effective for such a state to occupy; the black race, of which there cannot be less than 150,000,000 upon earth, is pre-eminently the race needing such a development, and prepared for it; and the United States are exactly in a condition to found such a commonwealth with this race, under circumstances most glorious to ourselves, the most hopeful to the world, and the most beneficial to the blacks." p. 14. This glorious prospect never can be realized, or at least very imperfectly, without a large system of emancipation in this country. This is the source whence the materials for this Christian commonwealth on the coast of Africa, must be principally derived. It would therefore be a great calamity to the world, if, in our blindness, we should dam up this current, and instead of allowing it to flow out as a healthful stream, force it to become a stagnant



pool, converting our own land, in some of its fairest portions, into malarious swamps. Let us, however, remember it is not simply men that Africa needs, but enlightened and Christian men, who shall carry with them religion and knowledge, the minister and the schoolmaster.

The radical principles of the plan of emancipation, then, as proposed in Kentucky, we believe meet the cordial approbation of the enlightened friends of the negro and of the country; a plan which contemplated a gradual emancipation, consistent with the rights of the slaveholder, and providing for the colonization of the liberated blacks. Though this plan, notwithstanding its merits, and the ability with which it was advocated, has failed for the present, we are persuaded it must ultimately succeed.

In the first place, it is demanded by the eternal principles of right. We have ever maintained that slaveholding is not in itself sinful, that the right to personal liberty is conditioned by the ability to exercise beneficially that right. We have ever been opposed therefore to the abolitionists, who demand immediate and universal emancipation, and who would exclude slaveholders as such from the communion of the church. But the right to hold slaves does not imply the right to treat them as brutes, or as mere chattels. It does not justify laws which conflict with the great principles of benevolence or justice, or with any of the enactments of the word of God. Men on all sides are apt to confound things essentially distinct. Because the scriptures allow slaveholding, just as they allow aristocratical or despotic forms of government, slaveholders are wont to appeal to the word of God in defence of slave laws which violate every scriptural principle. On the other hand, those who maintain that slaveholding is not sinful, are represented as sanctioning all the atrocities by which the system is any where or at any time attended. Both of these proceedings are illogical and unjust. Slaveholding may be justifiable, and yet the laws made by slaveholders be atrociously unjust. Slaveholding may be justified, and yet such slave laws be consistently condemned. No Christian has ever raised his voice in defence of the actual slave system as it exists in many parts of this country. Slavery in Kentucky, says Dr. Breckinridge, "presents this aspect: 1st, The rights of property are absolutely and universally abolished

as to slaves. 2d, The rights of person and character are unknown, as to them, except as the interest of the master and of the public peace may demand their recognition. 3d, The institution of marriage between slaves, has no legal recognition, nor do marital rights exist as to them. 4th, The relation of parent and child, as between slaves, is not recognised by law, except in determining questions of property." p. 13. Is it not monstrous to suppose that the Bible sanctions such laws as these? It might as well be said that the Bible sanctions all the cruelty and injustice ever committed by civil rulers, because it sanctions civil government. Every good man must respond to the indignant eloquence of Dr. Breckinridge, when he says, in reference to the rights just enumerated, that every one of them "is inherent in human nature, and that their existence and their protection lie at the foundation of human society, which could not exist for a day, under any form, if these rights were universally abolished. Moreover, they are all of divine authority; and as the state itself—that is, human society—is ordained of God, we have one of God's institutions abolishing as to an immense number of his rational creatures, the very foundations on which he has erected that institution, and rendered possible the social state he ordained for those creatures. This is a condition of things for whose *increase* there can be no justification; and whose everlasting continuance can be defended only on grounds which subvert the order of nature, the ordination of heaven, and the foundations of the social state." It is, therefore, no fair inference from the doctrine that slaveholding is not in itself sinful, that the Bible sanctions the actual system of slavery, or the slave laws now in force in this country. Much less can it be fairly inferred from the abstract lawfulness of slavery, that laws may be enacted and enforced to extend and perpetuate it. It is one thing to treat savages as savages, and another to endeavour to keep them in a state of barbarism. It is one thing to deny to minors the rights of adults, another to debase them that they may never exercise those rights. It is one thing to keep felons in prison, and another to force men to become or to remain felons that we may get their labour for nothing. Admitting, therefore, that a Christian may, with a good conscience be a slaveholder, he cannot be a Christian and deliberately endeavour to keep his slaves in a state of

ignorance and degradation in order to perpetuate their bondage. Nothing can be more distinct than the right to hold slaves, in certain circumstances, and the right to render slavery perpetual. Perpetual slavery implies perpetual ignorance and perpetual degradation. This the mass of slaveholders intuitively perceive, and hence in almost all slave states there are enactments, the design of which is to prevent the intellectual and social improvement of the blacks. It is everywhere seen and admitted that gradual improvement must lead to gradual emancipation, and therefore the former is strenuously resisted by those who are determined not to grant the latter. But as it is one of the clearest and highest duties of man to promote the improvement of his fellow men, as this duty is specially binding on parents and masters, in regard to their children and servants, and as the right to intellectual culture and moral and religious education is the most precious of all human rights, it follows that one of the greatest sins a man can commit against his fellows, is to endeavour to keep them ignorant and degraded that he may keep them in bondage.

If then it is the duty of a community in which slavery exists to provide for the education and social improvement of the slaves, which we presume no Christian will deny, then it is the duty of such community to adopt some system for emancipation. It is certainly not less clear, that improvement must lead to liberation, than that degradation is necessary to slavery. No man for a moment believes that if the slaves at the South were as well educated as the people of New York or Massachusetts, slavery could continue a month. Unless therefore men are prepared to adopt the monstrous doctrine that they have a right to keep millions of their fellow creatures in ignorance and debasement, they must admit that emancipation is a moral duty. Conscience is the only principle capable of competing with self-interest. It is therefore of great importance that slave-holders should be brought to see what God demands of them in this matter; that they cannot without violating his laws and forfeiting his favour, refuse to their slaves the benefits of education and the enjoyment of those rights as parents and husbands which are guaranteed to them by God himself. In other words, they should be brought to see that slavery cannot be perpetuated without doing violence to the most obvious imperative moral

principles. Still more important is it that non-slaveholders should be brought to see that they are committing a sin against God, as well as inflicting a grievous injury on their fellow men, in contending for the increase or indefinite continuance of slavery. We have great faith in the self-evidencing light of moral truth, and in its power over the conscience, we therefore believe that the advocates of emancipation, will yet succeed, if they can but keep up before the minds of the people, the great principle of *Duty*. This will do more than all arguments drawn from political economy, however just those arguments may be, or however powerfully they may be presented.

In the second place, emancipation is not only a duty, but it is unavoidable. The question which our slave-holding States have to decide is not, whether they will now adopt a system of emancipation, or remain indefinitely as they now are; but, whether they will prepare for emancipation while the evil is manageable, or have it forced upon them when every condition of the problem is a hundred fold more complicated. We believe it to be the intimate conviction of ninety-nine hundredths of the intelligent people in the United States that slavery in this country must come to an end. This conviction is as common at the South as it is at the North. The great effort is to procrastinate the crisis; to throw the decision and the trial on the coming generation. By this selfish policy the evils to be encountered are fearfully increased. Fifty years ago, with a slave population of seven or eight hundred thousand, emancipation and colonization would have been an easy work compared to what it now is, with three millions of slaves. It is an easy work now compared to what it will be fifty years hence. "Kentucky," says Dr. Breckinridge, "with six hundred thousand white persons, and two hundred thousand slaves, and the whole south wanting slave labour, presents a problem widely different from Kentucky with seven hundred thousand white persons, and five hundred thousand slaves, and the whole south fully supplied with slave labour. The one is a question easily solved, compared with the other; and all the increased difficulty must lie at the door of the non-slaveholder, if his vote produces it." p. 10. One reason, then, why slavery cannot be perpetual is that the slaves increase in a more rapid ratio than the whites, and by the mere force of numbers must occupy the land. The non-slaveholding



whites will rapidly withdraw from a community overstocked with slaves. This is a process which has already been going on for years. Thousands of the best portion of the population of Kentucky have sought homes in the free states of the west. Their places have been occupied by the blacks. Congregations once large and flourishing have, from this cause, dwindled down to insignificance. The natural tendency of this state of things is to render the disproportion between the whites and blacks constantly greater. And the unavoidable result must be that the negro race will come to possess the land. They will be too numerous to be profitable, and the time predicted by John Randolph (as we believe), must come, when the masters will run away from the slaves. This period may be more or less remote, but it is not the less certain, and the responsibility of bringing about this result will rest on those who vainly attempt to fight against God, in fighting against the laws which he has ordained.

But there is another reason why slavery cannot be perpetuated. It is from its nature a transition state. It supposes a low form of civilization, and must disappear as society advances and the slaves rise in intelligence and power. Under eastern despotism and the debasing systems of Paganism, the people may be kept in such degradation as to be perpetual bondmen; but in such a country, and in such an age as this, and under the all-penetrating light of the gospel, this is impossible. The state of our slave population is now immeasurably above that of the negroes under the dominion of the Portuguese in Brazil. Their condition must continue to improve under the controlling influence of a Christian public sentiment. It will be out of the power of slaveholders to make laws to keep out the light and warmth of Christian truth; and they themselves will not have the heart to persevere in the attempt. In this way, if in no other, slavery must cease. The slaves will cease to be minors; they will outgrow their state of pupillage, and their bonds will either drop from their limbs or be shaken off. We consider nothing more certain, under those laws which God has established, than that all attempts to perpetuate slavery in these United States must fail. The attempt, however, to render it permanent will, for this very reason, be all the more disastrous. It is an attempt to counteract the laws of nature and ordinances

of God, and must of necessity overwhelm in hopeless ruin those who engage in so insane an enterprise. The only safe course, as it is the only one consistent with Christian duty, is to improve the slaves, and to emancipate and remove them as rapidly as they are prepared for freedom. And as this can now be done without loss to the masters, or with full compensation for such loss, and with the prospect of removing the liberated blacks from the country, it is infatuation to resist the proposed plan. Hereafter emancipation must be granted, without compensation, and without the possibility of removal.

There is another consideration involved in what we have said, but which deserves separate mention. If slavery is founded on ignorance and degradation, if it is contrary to the will of God that such ignorance and degradation should be rendered permanent, then every attempt to perpetuate such a state is a direct violation of his will. It is a national sin, as it must be committed by the people in their capacity as a commonwealth, and therefore will inevitably lead to national calamity. The history of the world is one continued proof that God visits the iniquities of the fathers on the children of the third and fourth generation of those who hate him. Nations never sin with impunity. If they are guilty of habitual injustice towards their own dependent members, or against others, they are but laying up for themselves wrath against the day of wrath. So sure therefore as a righteous God rules among the nations, so certainly must the attempt to perpetuate slavery by keeping the slaves ignorant and degraded, work out a fearful retribution for the descendants of those by whom such attempt is made.

When to the considerations that emancipation is a duty, and that it is ultimately unavoidable, is added the obvious and weighty benefits which it must confer on all concerned, it is wonderful that a plan so fraught with blessings should not command universal favour. It will raise the black race from the degradation of uneducated bondmen, into enlightened freemen, the founders of a new empire for a continent. It will substitute white free men for negro slaves, as inhabitants of the fairest portions of our own country. It will give thousands of hands to guard our hearths, in place of thousands to be guarded against. It will give us the materials for flourishing schools and churches, instead of moral desolation. It will multiply

many fold the resources of the state, and secure its progress in all the arts and comforts of life. It will benefit all classes of the people, the slaveowners as well as others. They must reap the advantage of increasing prosperity. If emancipation be attended, as in the West Indies, by circumstances which depress all the resources of the country, then the slaveowners become the chief sufferers. But if for the slave population removed from the land, is substituted an enterprising race of free white men, then the slaveowners are the greatest gainers. No class of men in England has gained so much by the abolition of vassalage, and by the prosperity of the country, as the nobility. Instead of serfs and hovels their estates are covered with free men and cities. And if to-morrow the blacks of Kentucky could be transmuted into such men as make cities and villages spring up like cornfields, through the state of New York, the former slaveowners would find themselves princes. They are striving against their own best interests as well as the interests of the whole commonwealth, in clinging to an institution which must die, and which must poison the air where its disjected members lie.

We hope the friends of emancipation in Kentucky will not give up all for lost. Let such addresses as that of Dr. Breckinridge be spread over the state, and kept permanently in contact with the minds of the people. Though this is the only argument in favour of emancipation, we have had the good fortune to meet with, we are sure from the character of Dr. Breckinridge's associates, that there are many other addresses of a like kind, which ought to be preserved, and kept constantly in circulation. With the blessing of God on what is right and true, the people must ultimately be convinced that emancipation is a duty and a necessity.

## SHORT NOTICES.

The Saxons in England. A History of the English Commonwealth till the Period of the Norman Conquest. By John M. Kemble, M. A., F. C. P. S., London: Printed for Longman, Brown, Green, & Longmans. 18 9. 2 vols. 8vo.

We are happy to know that the attention of students in our colleges, is turning with increasing interest, to the history and literature of our Saxon ancestors. The value of this class of studies, in illustrating the origin and the peculiar genius of our language, our literature, our habits, our institutions, and indeed of everything which is characteristic of us, as a race of people, is so obvious that we cannot doubt that this attention will continue to grow, until we shall produce at no distant period, not only students, but scholars, in this interesting department of research. For a long time it was the reproach of English literature that those whose inclination or studies led them in this direction, were compelled to resort to the continent of Europe, for books and other facilities, for the prosecution of their researches. Beyond the very imperfect and incorrect lexicographical and grammatical labours of Somner, Hickes, Lye, Henley, and a few others of less note, scarcely anything was done till a very late period by the scholars of England, to throw light upon the historical and literary antiquities of the Saxons. The first work which attempted to free the true principles and structure of the language, from the awkward and cumbersome forms of the Latin Grammars of the age, was the Anglo-Saxon Grammar, (*Angelsaksisk Sprogkære*) of Prof. Rask, of Copenhagen. This was translated by Mr. Thorpe, and printed in English, we are surprised to say, at *Copenhagen*, in 1830. About the same time the study of the subject may be considered as having taken root in England. Among the first and most promising fruits of its culture, were the Grammar, and especially the complete, and admirable Dictionary, of Dr. Bosworth. Since that time the number of publications has increased in a very rapid ratio. Every necessary facility is now within the reach of the student of Anglo Saxon antiquities.

Among the results of the study thus opened to so many minds of a high literary order in England, we have to hail a series of historical and critical works of great value; chiefly produced within the last ten years. We may mention for the benefit of such as may be curious about the matter, the following recent works of this description:—"Ancient Laws and Institutes of England;" comprising laws enacted under the Anglo Saxon Kings from Ethelbert to Cnut, with an English translation of the Saxon: the laws called Edward the Confessor's; the laws of William the Conqueror, and those ascribed to Henry the First; also *Monumenta Ecclesiastica Anglicana*, from the seventh to the tenth century: and the ancient latin version of the Anglo Saxon laws,—with a copious Glossary, &c., by B. Thorpe, Esq.; printed under the direction of the Commissioners on the Public Records of the



Kingdom, and bearing date of 1840. "*Codex Diplomaticus Aevi Saxonici*;" in six volumes, by Mr. Kemble; the first vol. published in 1839, and the last in 1848. This work has been printed under the auspices of the Historical Society of England, and contains upwards of fourteen hundred documents, many of which are of very high historical value. "*The Rise and Progress of the English Commonwealth*," by Sir Francis Palgrave.

Besides these separate works, Mr. Bohn, the great London Book seller—whose stock is said to comprise twice as many vols. as the Library of the British Museum,—has commenced the re-publication of a very valuable series of ancient works, in a convenient and cheap form, under the title of the *Antiquarian Library*. This series already comprises, Mallet's *Northern Antiquities*, *The Six old English Chronicles*, viz.: *Ethelwerd*,—*Asser's Life of Alfred*,—*Geoffrey of Monmouth*,—*Gildas*,—*Nennius*,—and *Richard of Cirencester*,—*The Chronicles of William of Malmesbury* and *Roger of Wendover*. In the department of Literature, we have as the fruits of the Royal Society of Literature, two goodly octavo volumes of the *Biographia Britannica Literaria*, covering respectively the Anglo Saxon and Anglo Norman periods, and some eight volumes of *Transactions*, containing many papers of exceeding interest and value, on the subject before us. We have also within a few years the re-publication of curious and important works, both to the student of literature and history, now numbering over forty different volumes, published under the supervision of the Camden Society, and edited by those veteran literary antiquaries, Thorpe, Halliwell, Wright, Ellis, and others.

We have confined ourselves, in this enumeration, to works accessible to the mere English student: passing by the able and profound discussions, on these and kindred topics, by continental scholars. Of course no one who wishes to study the subject thoroughly, will fail to consult the researches and reasonings of Grimm,\* Zeuss,† Müller,‡ and others.

We return from this brief bibliographical excursus, (into which we have been tempted for the benefit of the few, we fear to the annoyance and weariness of the many), to say that Mr. Kemble, the author of the work before us, and the latest on its subject, is well known as one of the most thorough English scholars devoted to this department of learning. He has drawn the materials for his work, not only from the labours of his predecessors in the same line, but from the fresh virgin mines of antiquarian learning, which he has been himself the first to discover and to work. He

\* "*Deutsche Grammatik*," 3 vols., 8 vo., Gottingen, 1831. This is a Grammar of all the Germanic languages, including the Anglo Saxon. Every one of course knows its value in philology.

† *Die Deutschen, und die Nachbarstämme*: by Zeuss. Munich 1837. This is a remarkable book, in which the author sifts, after the style so peculiarly German, the details of the Early Teutonic tribes, and shows with masterly analysis and skill, how fragmentary and uncertain they are, and how unworthy of confidence as settled history.

‡ *Der Lex Salica, und der Lex Angliorum et Werinorum, &c.*, by Herman Müller. A perfect thesaurus of instructive information, in regard to these people after they came into relations with the Romans.

has therefore produced a book of standard value. There is scarcely a question touching the individual, the domestic, the social and political life and the institutions of the founders of the great Anglo Saxon race, into which he has not entered, and we think we may add, in the general settled, by his researches and his reasonings. His great merit, as a philosophical historian, is that which is so acceptable to English readers, the certainty and trustworthiness of the conclusions which he reaches. We get few speculations, but much knowledge, from his work. His object was to uncover the history of the origin, rise, and characteristics of our Anglo American laws, institutions and customs. This he has done in so learned and satisfactory a way, that we earnestly hope, both for the credit and the benefit, of American scholarship, some of our enterprising publishers will give us the work in a more accessible and less costly form. We would urge this the rather, because we would fain hope at least, that our provincial press has not kept pace with the growing demand for more ample and accurate knowledge on this important and interesting subject. The only works we can recall at the moment, as fairly naturalized among us, are the large, learned, but somewhat confused, often unsatisfactory, and seldom readable, *History of the Anglo Saxons*, by Mr. Sharon Turner; and the small, but compact and useful little work, Vernon's "*Guide to the Anglo Saxon Tongue*:"—which is made up of an Abstract of Prof. Rask's *Grammar*, (slightly modified, chiefly by changing the points of comparison from the Scandinavian to the English language) together with some extracts from the Anglo Saxon, both in prose and verse, and a few additional notes, intended to facilitate the translation of the extracts, and to give the student an insight into the idiosyncrasies of the original tongue. We should be glad also to try our powers of persuasion on some enterprising publisher, in the hope of inducing him to give us a cheap and convenient edition of Bosworth's *Dictionary*, not omitting, as the late English edition does, the admirable introduction. It is high time that distinct attention should be given to the subject in our colleges, at least to such as may desire to study it, for the sake of the light which it throws upon the origin, idioms and apparent anomalies of our tongue. We happen to know that the experiment, necessarily very imperfect for the want of facilities, made in the college nearest to us, has shown that there is a disposition among enterprising students, to undertake the matter; which might probably lead to distinguished scholarship in some cases, were the necessary books within the reach of their limited means.

**An Address on Scholastic Education**, delivered before the Presbyterian High School of Lafayette, Ala., on the occasion of its Anniversary. By Rev. William M. Cunningham, of Lagrange, Ga. Montgomery, Ala. 1849.

Among the blessed fruits growing out of the recently adopted scheme of Presbyterian parochial and academic education, we reckon the general and thorough discussion into which it has precipitated our church, in regard to the

nature, objects and means, of common school and collegiate training. The usages which had silently grown up in this country, had led our intelligent men, not excepting most of our ministers, to accept the wretched educational empiricism, which undertakes to sever the so called secular part of education from the religious. All truth, in every department, has a religious element, because all truth, not excepting the purest and highest mathematical generalizations, has a relation to the great first truth. Who does not see that if you take religion out of history, the residue is no longer true history at all. History without God, is just as incomplete, and unmeaning, and unintelligible, as the universe without God. And are our children to be taught atheism under the garb of history, as they may be, six days in the week; because an opposite belief may be inculcated by professional religious teachers, on the seventh? And what sort of citizens and members of the social circle are to be produced by the process, which practically dissociates religion from all the public and attractive relations and events of life, and shuts it up in the narrow, and to young minds often repulsive, circle of theological doctrines, and humbling religious experiences? The *Augsburgh Gazette*, the able organ of the anti-religious party in Germany, in discussing the subject of education, significantly says, "religion must be forcibly expelled from society, and art and poetry realizing the ideals of the true, the beautiful and the good take its place," and then subsequently adds, "in government, revolution everywhere, reform nowhere." Here we have the ripe fruit of that system which excludes God from history and society and education, and shuts him up in the church.

Now what security can we have that teachers making no profession of any religious belief, sometimes fortified by an express prohibition to inculcate any religious views whatever, or to use even the Bible in the school, may not silently and even unintentionally inoculate the minds of our children with a spirit like this? No man can avoid communicating his own inner life and character, to the susceptible minds and hearts of those who are about him in the capacity of pupils, provided he teaches anything at all. Every man has a religious belief of some sort, and every man propagates that belief, whether he will or not. It will tincture and underlie all his teaching on every subject. Children will imbibe it without knowing it. Now if it is not a matter of indifference what the religious belief of our children is to be, it cannot be a matter of indifference what the belief of their teachers is.

But we beg pardon: we were not to discuss the subject, but simply to register another clear, manly and able discussion of this great and vital question, drawn out by another successful experiment in the case of the East Alabama Presbyterian High School; and to thank Mr. Cunningham for his contribution to the cause of truth and order, in this timely address. Such discussions all over the church, will soon set public sentiment right, and set it in motion also, towards the attainment of the true safety and glory of our church—a complete religious education.

A Discourse upon the Power of Voluntary Attention; delivered

before the Rochester Atheneum and Mechanics' Association, by J. H. McIlvaine, Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Rochester. 1849.

Very wholesome advice, very agreeably administered. Mr. McIlvaine has fairly put into the hands of his hearers, the clew which, if faithfully followed up, will conduct them to intellectual culture and literary distinction. And what is better still, he has clearly and manfully opened to them the truth, that the only perfect resting place for the soul, and the highest form of intellectual and aesthetic gratification, as well as the only satisfactory form of moral goodness, are to be found in life-union with God in Christ.

Lectures on the Shorter Catechism of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, addressed to Youth. By Ashbel Green, D.D. Philadelphia. Presbyterian Board of Publication. Two volumes 12mo. pp. 447 and 472.

It is scarcely necessary to say, that these lectures were originally delivered by Dr. Green, to his own congregation in Philadelphia; and were listened to by a highly intelligent audience with very great interest. They were afterwards published in the *Christian Advocate*: and a portion of them were reprinted in a separate volume. The present is, we believe, the only complete reprint of these truly rich and instructive lectures, forming, as they do, a short and simple, but complete and admirable body of divinity.

The Internal Evidence of the Holy Bible; or the Bible proved from its own pages to be a Divine Revelation. By J. J. Janeway, D.D. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication.

Dr. Janeway is, of course, too well known, as a sound and able theologian of the old school, to require anything beyond a mere announcement of this work. Its nature and object are fully explained in the title page; and it is sufficient to say that the execution is such as those who know the venerable author would expect.

The Claims of our Country on Literary Men. An Oration before the Phi Beta Kappa Society of Harvard University. July 19, 1849. By George W. Bethune. Cambridge. John Bartlett. 1849.

Dr. Bethune has so mingled just praise of talent and virtue with delicate chastenings of New England foibles, that the necessary result must be profit without offence. In a passage which doubtless called forth some applause, he reminds our excellent brother of the east, that "he rather wearies us with his inexhaustible eulogy on the Pilgrim Fathers, who, he seems to think, have begotten the whole United States." Dr. Bethune



has gently indicated some of these specks on a most respectable fabric. Nor does he allow the class of Mock-Puseyites, and mediæval dreamers to escape a fillip; that "sombre affectation, which looks back admiringly and regretfully upon the middle centuries, as Lot's wife would have looked upon the Dead Sea, had she survived till next morning." In quite another vein there is a passage concerning Lamartine, which is eloquently beautiful. On the whole, we regard this as the most effervescent and witty of all the author's productions, with more of the faults belonging to this sort of writing. We enter a claim likewise on behalf of the descendants of Scottish Presbyterians for a more prominent place among American Protestants, than Dr. Bethune has given them, in one of his striking passages, beside the Huguenots and Reformed Dutch.

**The Pestilence, a Divine Visitation. A Sermon, preached August 3, 1849, the day of the National Fast. By Symmes C. Henry, Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, of Cranbury, N. J. Princeton. J. T. Robinson. pp. 18.**

We have been struck with the fact that the number of printed Fast Day sermons, on this great subject, is small; it is with pleasure therefore that we notice the only one which has hitherto reached us. In a plain, sensible, scriptural and practical manner, Mr. Henry inculcates the lessons, that this pestilence is from God; that it is a visitation for our sins; that it becomes us to consider our duty in regard to it. In reviewing God's marvelous loving-kindness and signal answering of our prayers, we feel bound to add, that it will be a sign that we have failed of national repentance, unless we afford the tribute of national thanksgiving. Why should not our several state thanksgiving-days be merged in a festival of holy joy over the whole United States!

**Inaugural Address, delivered before the Board of Trustees of Hampden Sidney College, January 10, 1849. By L. W. Green, D.D., President. Pittsburgh. pp. 29.**

The opening of this address is happily derived from the fact that it was pronounced just two centuries after the day on which Charles the First was arraigned in Westminster Hall. The two distinguished men, who gave their names to this college, are thus introduced; and a historical picture of the following periods prepares the way for Patrick Henry, Samuel Davies, and the good and great Virginians who founded the institution. The Discourse is learned and glowing, and has much of the animation and fancy which belong to Southern minds. In the plea which the author makes for the union of accuracy and comprehensiveness in education, as qualities by no means incompatible, and equally indispensable, he touches a chord which cannot vibrate too often or too strongly: in our apprehension, he has indicated just here the true source of all individual and all academical improvement. We rejoice in the eminent success of President Green in his early labours, and do most heartily bid him God speed!

An Address on the occasion of the Author's resigning the office of President of Miami University, Commencement day, August 9, 1849. Cincinnati. 1849. pp. 36.

A few lines is all that we can give to this address, from the pen of a learned and able man: and we cannot therefore discuss the important questions which it suggests. Such are the topics of church and state education, sectarian colleges, and the like. Several of the principles laid down and argued appear to us equally true and valuable. Of their application to some latent controversies, which betray themselves in these pages, we know nothing and can utter no judgment. The production evinces the hand of a scholar and an independent thinker; yet there are strokes of sarcasm in the composition which perhaps fall sharply in places unsuspected by us.

Speeches, Poems and Miscellaneous Writings on the subjects connected with Temperance and the Liquor Traffic. By C. Jewett, M. D.

Christianity against Infidelity, or the truth of the Gospel History. By T. B. Thayer. New edition. Cincinnati.

Loyola, or Jesuitism in its rudiments. By Isaac Taylor, author of the Natural History of Enthusiasm. 12mo. Carters.

Bibel-Atlas nach den neuesten und besten Hülfsquellen, von Kiepert. Garrigue.

This admirable Bible-atlas costs one dollar, and is from the latest and best authorities.

Homilies of St. Augustine; translated, with notes and indexes. Oxford. 2 vols. 8vo.

This is the twentieth volume of the Library of the Fathers.

Sermons, by the Rev. W. A. Butler, with a Memoir by the Rev. T. Woodward, M. A. London.

A Collection of Anthems, by eminent English composers. London. 4to. pp. 112.

The Apostles' School of Prophetic Interpretation. By C. Maitland. 8vo. pp. 474. London. 1849.

Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography, by J. Stephen. London. 2 vols. 8vo. 1849.

Plenary Inspiration, by the Rev. D. Dyer. London. 1849.

The Works of Bishop Cosin. Volume Third. London. 1849.

A Sketch of the History of the Jews from the end of the Cap-

tivity to the Coming of Christ. By the Rev. G. B. Johns. London. 1849.

Foxe's Acts and Monuments of the Church. New edition. 8 vols. 8vo. London.

Jahn's Biblical Archaeology. By Prof. Upham. Fifth edition. New York. 1849.

Pastoral Reminiscences: by Shepard K. Kollock: with an Introduction by A. Alexander, Professor in the Theological Seminary, Princeton. New York. M. W. Dodd. 1849. 12mo. pp. 286.

We have long known and esteemed the Rev. Mr. Kollock, not only as the brother of the late eloquent Doctor Henry Kollock, but as a sound, laborious and useful minister of our church. We now welcome him as an agreeable and edifying narrator of events in his varied clerical life; adding our voice of recommendation to that of the Reverend Doctor Alexander, in the Introduction.

Sacred Scenes and Characters, By J. T. Headley, New York: Baker & Scribner, 1849.

Erasmus's Pilgrimages to St. Mary of Walsingham, and St. Thomas of Canterbury. Newly translated and illustrated with notes, By John Gough Nichols. 8vo. pp. 272. London.

Illustrations of the Bible from the Monuments of Egypt. By W. C. Taylor, plates, 12mo. London: 1849.

Scripture Lands, being a visit to the Scenes of the Bible. By W. S. Woodcock. Plates, 12mo. London: 1849.

The Prayer-Book, considered in reference to the Romish system, Nineteen Sermons. By J. D. Maurice. London. 1849. 12mo.

A Pastor's Tribute to one of his flock, or the Memoirs of the late Hannah L. Murray. By the Rev. Gardiner Spring, D.D. Carter & Brothers, New York. 8vo. Fine Portrait.

Annals of the English Bible, by the Rev. Christopher Anderson. Revised, abridged, and continued to the present time. By the Rev. Samuel J. Prime, Secretary of the American Bible Society. Carter & Brothers, New York. 1849. 8vo.

Liberty's Triumph; a Poem. By Robert W. Landis, New

York. John Wiley, 12mo. pp. 544. "Mediocribus esse poetis, etc."

The Puritans in England, and the Pilgrim Fathers. By Prof. Stowell and D. Wilson, F. S. R. New York. Carters, 12mo. 1849.

St. Vincent's Manual, containing a selection of prayers, &c. Murphy. Baltimore. 1849. Recommended by the archbishop of Baltimore, &c. 1849.

On the Religious Idea. By W. J. Fox. London. 1849. 8vo.

Christian Memorials. By William Ormond. 23 plates, London. 1849. 4to.

Sermons preached in the Parish Church of St. Mary's, Exeter. By the Rev. W. Maskell. London. 1849. 8vo.

Institutes of Theology. By the Rev. Thomas Chalmers, D. D., in Ten Volumes. Vol. I. Seventh volume of Posthumous works. Harpers. New York. 1849.

The Doctrines and Practices of the Church of Rome truly represented. By Edward Stillingfleet, D.D., Bishop of Worcester. With Preface and Notes, (forming more than half the volume,) By William Cunningham, D. D. Principal and Professor of Divinity, and Church History, New College. Edinburgh. Edinburgh: Johnstone. 8vo. 1849.

Foot-prints of the Creator, or the Asterolepsis of Stromness. By Hugh Miller, Author of the Old Red Sandstone. Edinburgh: Johnstone & Hunter. 8vo. 1849.

An Essay on Christian Baptism. By the Hon. and Rev. Baptist W. Noel, M. A. London: Nisbet & Co. 8vo. 1849.

A memoir of Lady Colquhon. By the Rev. James Hamilton F. L. S. Author of Life in Earnest, &c. London: Nisbet & Co. 8vo.

A History of the Hebrew Monarchy from the Administration of Samuel to the Babylonish Captivity. By Francis Newman, D.D., Oxon. London: John Chapman. New York: G. P. Putnam. 1849. 8vo. pp. 370.

An English book, published anonymously in 1847, and now provided with an American title-page and a fresh date, together with the author's name, but exhibiting even the same table of errata as at first. Dr. Newman.



we believe, is a brother of the famous apostate from the Church of England, but seems himself to have left it in an opposite direction. The present is a fair specimen of Anglican scholarship and general cultivation modified by German ingenuity and skepticism. With much that is interesting and instructive, it exhibits doubts on points which even Germany now owns to be established, and an amusing deference for theories and arguments, some of which have been abandoned by their own inventors, and none of which are really defensible or tenable in opposition to the old belief. On these accounts we cannot recommend the book as really adding to our valuable store of sacred learning.

The life of the Rev. John Macdonald, A. M., late Missionary Minister from the Free Church of Scotland at Calcutta; including selections from his Diary and Letters. By the Rev. W. K. Tweedie, minister of the Free Tolbooth Church Edinburgh. Edinburgh: John Johnstone. 1849. 12mo. pp. 464.

A delightful specimen of religious, ministerial, and missionary biography, belonging to the same general class with the lives of Brainerd and Martyn, but with quite as much originality and distinctive character as either of those favourite works, with which it agrees perfectly in tendency and spirit. The book has moreover a peculiar interest of its own from its connexion with what may be called the Scottish School of Foreign Missions, of which Dr. Duff is the apostle, and, if we err not, Macdonald's biographer one of the most useful and active managers at home. With the usual qualifications requisite in cases where a free display is made of personal and secret experience, the book may be safely recommended to our own religious public, which is never likely to be injured by an impression of real evangelical and experimental piety from abroad.

A Pastor's Memorial to his former flock, consisting of Sermons and Addresses, the Relics of a bygone ministry. By the late Rev. John Macdonald, Missionary Minister, &c. Edinburgh: John Johnstone. 12mo. 1849.

The Suffering Saviour, a Tract for Sinners, originally addressed to a Sabbath School. By the late Rev. John Macdonald, Edinburgh: John Johnstone. 18mo. 1849.

Memoirs and Manuscript of Isabel Hood. By the late Rev. John Macdonald, with an Introductory Notice, By Hugh Miller. 3d edition. Edinburgh: John Johnstone. 18mo. 1849.

Calvin and Servetus. The Reformer's share in the Trial of Michael Servetus historically ascertained. From the French. With Notes and Additions. By the Rev. W. K. Tweedie. Edinburgh: Johnstone. Svo. 1849.

The Atonement of Christ the Hope of His People. By the Rev. W. K. Tweedie. 3rd edition. Edinburgh: Johnstone. 18mo. 1849.

The Sacrament of Baptism: its Nature, Design, and Obligations. By the Rev. W. K. Tweedie. 2d edition. Edinburgh: Johnstone. 1849.

The Cross of Christ, the Call of God, Saving Faith. An Inquiry into the Completeness and Extent of the Atonement, with especial reference to the Universal Offer of the Gospel and the Universal Obligation to believe. By the Rev. R. S. Candlish, D.D. 2d edition. Edinburgh; Svo. 1849.

The Legal Profession: its moral nature and practical connection with civil Society. An Address, delivered before the Philomathesian Society of Kenyon College. By John T. Brooke, D.D., Rector of Christ Church, Cincinnati. 1849.

This is a discourse of a high moral tone. While the author attributes to the legal profession its due importance, and assigns it a high place in the class of learned avocations, he exposes with the justice of a Christian moralist, the evils which too often are not only tolerated but sanctioned by its members.

The Bible, a Book for the world. An address delivered before the Cadet's Bible Society of the Virginia Military Institute, May 1st, 1849. By B. M. Smith, Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, Staunton, Va. New York: John Wiley, 161 Broadway.

The occasion on which this address was delivered determined its topic, which the author has treated in a manner adapted to make the best impression on the minds of his hearers and readers.

A discourse, delivered in the Second Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, on the Third of August, 1849; the day of fasting recommended by the President, General Taylor. By Andrew Bowen, Pastor.

The text of this discourse is Amos iv. 12, "Prepare to meet thy God, O Israel." This solemn call the preacher addresses to his country, and says Prepare to meet thy God, O America. It is an impressive exhibition of some of the more prominent of the national sins, for which we ought to repent. The writer dwells specially on the sins connected with slavery, and blames the General Assembly which sat at Pittsburgh, in May last, for its action on that subject, in a way he probably would avoid were he better informed of the circumstances.









Repaired by  
Bob Armstrong  
June 2008





